









*Ser: 1856*

FOUR

ADVENT LECTURES,

ON

CONCORDATS,

DELIVERED AT ST. MARY'S, MOORFIELDS.

BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

---

LONDON :

BURNS, 17, PORTMAN STREET; DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND  
STREET; RICHARDSON, 147, STRAND;  
DUBLIN: J. DUFFY; PRESTON: E. BULLER;  
BRISTOL: AUSTIN & JAMES.

---

1855.

W. DAVY & SON, Printers, 8, Gilbert Street, Oxford Street.

FOUR  
ADVENT LECTURES,

ON

CONCORDATS,

DELIVERED AT ST. MARY'S, MOORFIELDS.

BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

---

LECTURE I.

---

LONDON: BURNS, 17, PORTMAN STREET; DOLMAN, 61, NEW  
BOND STREET; RICHARDSON, 147, STRAND; DUBLIN: J.  
DUFFY; PRESTON: E. BULLER; BRISTOL: AUSTIN & JAMES;

And by order of all Booksellers.

---

1855.

W. DAVY & SON, Printers, 8, Gilbert Street, Oxford Street.



## FOUR LECTURES, ETC.

---

It is a duty of justice and of charity, which is not confined to any particular body, but whenever, through prejudice, through misrepresentation, or through that proneness to err, which belongs to all men, a view is taken of any great topic which appears to those who may be affected by it to require correction and explanation, to rectify the error, to remove groundless apprehension, to put in its true light that which has been distorted or disguised. In other words, it is for them to discharge that duty which at this holy season, the Church attributes to the precursor of our Lord; to make straight the crooked, and to prepare the way for truth by removing the obstacles to its apprehension.

It was thus that a few years ago, when this country was thrown into a state of religious excitement almost bordering in many cases on frenzy, that we, conscious that the whole of that excitement arose from a simple misunderstanding of the true state of the case—that in reality, its cause was a simple domestic affair of Catholics, did not hesitate at once to face that tide of strong prejudice with a fair and simple explanation, and we succeeded, with many sincere and upright minds, in removing the cause of that, to us, most painful, and, as it almost appeared, dangerous excitement. It was during this season five years ago, when day after day saw a new impulse given to that attack, a torrent of anti-catholic feeling spreading like a deluge over the land, when it seemed almost perilous to raise our voice in defence of ourselves or of the Church—it was during this very season of Advent, that on each Sunday evening I treated of the subject which caused much commotion and alarm, and I found an abundant auditory willing to listen to my words, which were words of peace and truth, and to accept, kindly and charitably, the just explanation which I felt myself called upon to give.

And now I find the public mind, not, indeed, in a ferment equal to that which I have alluded to, yet partaking of its nature. There is almost, each day, an awakening of the same alarm in the public mind, in consequence of the Holy See having entered into an amicable treaty with a great Empire, concerning the final settlement and arrangement of its Ecclesiastical affairs. When we look upon the cause of this excitement, we should think that, apart

from religious bitterness or prejudice, it would have no hold upon the public mind whatever; no more than if one Kingdom had entered into a commercial treaty with another, or into some other international arrangements, not in any way affecting our commerce or our interests. Indeed, far more important measures of a public or political character, have been heard of abroad, without exciting an equal amount of feeling. You understand that I allude to that Concordat which has been lately ratified between the Pope, as the acknowledged head of the Catholic Church, and the Emperor, the civil ruler of the Empire of Austria. Not only has the text of the Concordat been made the subject of observation—not only has it been reproduced in various journals, and commented upon—not only have letters been written drawing from it the most extraordinary inferences, but it has been made the motive and the occasion of a series of writings, exceedingly painful not alone to Catholics, who must keenly feel the bitterness and the falsehood of the remarks made, but to every one who has generous feeling, or who has at heart the real happiness and interests of his country.

Now I have thought that, while so much misunderstanding on an ecclesiastical transaction has been erroneously, (perhaps maliciously), presented to the public of this country, it was my duty, charged as I am most naturally here, with the interests of the Catholic Church, to come forward in a bold and manful way, and put before you unflinchingly, what is the doctrine, and what are the principles that have actuated all parties in this arrangement, to show you how reasonable all that has been done is, and how far there is from the slightest ground, on the part of any one here, to complain of it.

I have said to come forward manfully and unflinchingly, for that has always been my practice, and I have not yet seen reason to repent of it. I have spoken bold truths: whatever was uppermost in my mind after having maturely considered it, (as I trust I consider every word, I utter in this pulpit,) in the presence of God; for I would not say a word to you which I did not feel in my conscience justified in saying, and which I would not place after having spoken it, on that altar, which is the altar of truth, as it is the altar of the God of truth. If, therefore, I shall again speak plainly, if some degree of honest indignation warms my words, it is because I have at heart the cause of truth, and because I have it so much at heart, that I would rather offend you in some degree, in pronouncing it, than, by at all suppressing it, gain your interest or indulgence.

It would almost appear to those who watch the signs of the times in these days, that the religion of this country requires to be kept alive by periodical ague fits of terror or amazement; that it is like a cauldron seething, that from time to time must boil over, and cast around it burning ingredients which scorch and inflame; or rather, it would seem, that religion here in England instead of being that religion "pure and undefiled," which resembles a perennial fountain,

ever pouring forth waters to refresh and invigorate, and flowing on every side to bestow fertility, prosperity, and joy, is more like a volcano, which requires for its relief, from time to time, not only an outburst, which may be heard to the extremities of the earth, but has within it a lava-tide, which overflows and threatens to burn up and reduce to desolation all that comes within its destructive range. It would almost appear as if some thought that religion is to be kept alive by a fire, not such as descended from the Holy Spirit in soft and lambent flames, and penetrated into the bosoms of the Apostles, but from a fire burning from a lower depth, the abode of uncharitableness and hate. It would appear as if the religion of many in this country had something in it explosive, and must endeavour to destroy everything around it. It is no longer a pouring forth on all sides, of gravely written books, such as in old times were used in controversy; if that were all, it could well be borne. But it seems as if those who raise their voices to enlighten the public, and wish them to have an echo through the whole world, chose as their great religious weapon personal scurrility; applying the most shameful epithets to the most exalted and noble of the earth, whether spiritual or temporal in their power. There issues from every quarter, all that can excite the scornful laugh, or the spiteful sneer, even almost indecent jests on matters of religion the most sacred. Thus has been treated this late Concordat, a solemn treaty between an Emperor and the Head of the Catholic Church—a treaty the result of the greatest deliberation and care—which here is treated as though it had been some miserable fiction of a romantic brain, or as if it had been the laughable production of two or three persons who had met to amuse the world. No measure has been kept in the terms used, no insults spared in the names of scorn applied to it. And this is thought to be the right way of expressing the mind of a great and mighty nation, which claims to speak to the ends of the earth, and send forth its oracles across the ocean; this is to be the voice of a people that professes to treat religion always with the greatest respect and dignity; and, that almost affects to be the only religious nation on the face of earth. Such however is the language now held by those who speak in its name! How will it be received abroad? Do you think that your character as a noble people, as one of great gravity in its judgments, of great wisdom in its legislation, of great clearness and comprehensiveness of view, will be enhanced by thus shewing in what manner topics like this, and the dignities of those whom God has raised, and whom millions venerate, are treated by you? Have we yet to learn that there is a dignity in silence, a greatness in reserve; that there is a majesty in grave and solemn argument or counsel? Have we yet to learn that if we wish to have our opinions make way abroad, and carry just weight to the ends of the earth, they must not be as arrows, lightly feathered and random-aimed? It requires the great and noble wings of the eagle to soar to that higher

flight which shall be looked up to with respect by Empires. To aim as far, it requires that strong, that well poised, that slowly moving action, which shews deliberation, and which is significant of strength, which is an evidence of perseverance, and is the demonstration of conscious power. Such is the record of our country's thought, to go forth from nation to nation, giving each an oracle to be received as the fruit of wisdom, and the result of well matured deliberation.

But even this is not all. How can we expect for a moment. that the judgments that have thus been hastily formed, and which are intended to react on foreign countries, will have the slightest weight? I say it with joy that they can not. Here are two states; one, a mighty Empire, which has always been proverbial for the slowness of its resolves, and the number of its counsellors, an Empire vast, and with immense resources, not merely of natural but of intellectual wealth, which draws its counsellors from a variety of nations, speaking many tongues; that nation through its Emperor surrounded by these counsellors, has been going on for two years discussing, clause by clause, the treaty which has now appeared, with much and anxious minuteness; while on the other side there was a prelate and colleague of my own, not only a colleague in ecclesiastical rank, but one who, in ancient times, sat at my side on the same bench in the same schools, and of whose character in youth I can fully testify; there was I say on the other side, this Ecclesiastic, remarkable not for what is called the cunning of this world, but for real and genuine piety, for great qualities, for close application and high success in study, a man of great experience in the treatment of Ecclesiastical affairs, for he had been Papal Nuncio at other courts before he was Legate at Vienna. You have thus two powers conferring, of which the first is far superior to most others in the vastness of its dominion, while the Pope on the other hand, has his experienced counsellors, and the wisdom of the whole Church at his command. For two whole years this negotiation goes on: there is not a sentence proposed at Vienna but it is sent to Rome; it is there discussed; it is returned again; if necessary it is sent back once more: and not a single proposition is accepted until it has been communicated as often as there are difficulties raised, when at length it is adopted. This, I repeat, is not until two years at least have elapsed. If there had been any errors, how much time was there to correct, how much leisure to repent, how much opportunity to go back on either side. At last this solemn treaty is signed and ratified by the two great powers. It comes to us in the first place from some correspondent of the newspapers abroad, who in his remarks on it showed that he could not even understand its phrases, and did not know the meaning of the words used in it.\* It comes here, the result

\* For example, the word *Kongrua*, that is *congrua dotatio*.

of so much deliberation, every word weighed ; drawn up too, in the peculiar language of Catholic Ecclesiastical diplomacy, its words having peculiar meanings, different from those which are made use of in ordinary Latin, so that it requires persons versed to some extent in the Latin language in which it is written, and in the principles of Catholic administration and of Canon Law, really well to understand it; and yet it is not two hours in the hands of a newspaper editor—who has never thought on the subject before, who has never studied and never considered it—and he acts upon it at once—his pen flying rapidly under the influence of his prejudice, and impelled by the necessity of not losing a day, so as to be the first before the public—and so, with indignant denunciation, he pulls the whole of this treaty to pieces; he knows more about the interests of Austria and the wants of the Church there, of evils existing and the remedies to be applied, than the Pope and Emperor and all their counsellors together after two years' deliberation! Oh! what are men abroad to think after this, of our wisdom, or prudence, or justice, or our common sense? How many thousands have been carried away by the flippant remarks, by the dashing phrases, by the foul epithets, and by that tone of superiority, by which such writers seem to place themselves so far above the wisest of men in other countries! Thousands indeed accept and read such writings with applause, rather than take the trouble to understand the subject; exclaiming that they never heard anything so dreadful. They ask, "Have you seen the Concordat?" of which probably they have not read one word. They tell you that it was dictated by the Pope; that everything was given up by Austria; and that all their hopes of that great nation have been dashed to the ground by this miserable servility to the Holy See. Is it thus that we are to keep up our character with other nations for deliberation and judgment, and wise comprehensiveness of view? On the contrary, will not the conclusion to which all come be this: "Well, after all, if there is nothing more than declamation and abuse to be urged against this Concordat, it must be something really good and wise. If no more solid objection can be brought against it than hard words it must have been well arranged, and have been the result of great deliberation, wisdom, and judgment." That is the judgment which will be passed upon our rash excitement. I shall indeed be surprised if this reaction of sentiment does not go further even here than it seems to have done.

Because, when a few years ago, the Hierarchy in this country was the great topic, and its discussion the great cause of excitement, what used to be said? "What business has the Pope to come and interfere with us? We will not allow it. We will resent it. He shall see we know what to think of it." In vain we urged that after all it was a mere domestic arrangement of our own; that we had required Bishops, and that we had gone to the Holy See and had obtained them, and that in no way did this concession take

anything from or in the least affect Protestants. It was said "We care not for all that, the Pope may act elsewhere as he pleases; but he must not act in England; he must not usurp jurisdiction here." Well, he goes to Austria; and in what way can what has been done affect you? In what way can it possibly touch any single interest belonging to this country, or affect our moral, social, or political condition? How can a Concordat between Austria and the Holy See tend us in the most distant way? Will not other nations say "Why is England so indignant? What is the meaning of these articles and writings breathing such anger against Austria for getting her own ecclesiastical affairs settled without interfering with anyone else?" I am almost surprised that the agitation does not go further. Why are not county meetings called together to protest against the Emperor of Austria assenting to a measure not agreeable to the English public? Why does not the city of London meet; why is not the Court of Aldermen convened to protest against the Pope's concluding a Concordat with Austria without consulting the livery? Is it to be our policy in England to meddle and interfere with the internal arrangements of every other kingdom, while preaching up non-interference and protesting against such interference with ourselves? Why, if one-half of what has been said concerning other potentates had been said about our gracious Queen, in regard to matters of purely domestic interest, there would have been a commotion from one end of the country to the other. Had there been in foreign papers such public abuse of our Queen, as has been seen in this country against continental sovereigns, one of whom is our ally, and the other is at peace with us, there would have been a loud demand for reparation for such indecent outrages.

This is an introductory and preliminary lecture—the discussion of the subject being reserved for subsequent lectures. But I premise these remarks, because I am desirous of a fair and unbiassed discussion, divested of that excitement which has been raised in the public mind, and of a certain feeling of indignation, arising chiefly from their not knowing what this Concordat is.

The empire of Austria is vast, and extended over great varieties both of lands and of races; it is an empire which presents to us an extent of territory, not only equal to the islands which form our kingdom, but also not incommensurate with the many dependencies in the form of islands, colonies, and mainland which united form the Empire of Great Britain. Now this vast Austrian Empire, though more compact and united, and having no distant dependencies, is even of greater variety of tongue and race than ours. Putting aside our Indian possessions, where the mass of the people are heathens, not belonging to European civilization, we have in the small compass of our own kingdoms, three populations—English, Scotch, and Irish, to which may be added the Welsh—speaking different languages or dialects, but at the same time immediately

under the eye of the Crown ; but looking at the vast space covered by the Austrian Empire, we find not less than five different languages in it—everyone of which (I may mention) is spoken with ease by its youthful Emperor, as well as other languages which do not belong to his dominion. In this vast space it is natural (such is the present state of the world,) that there should be a variety of religious communities, as there are elsewhere. There are, for example, Protestants scattered more or less densely, in some parts very thinly ; there are the Greeks of the United Church, that is, Greeks, who though using the rite of the Greek Church, are still a portion of the Catholic Church, acknowledging all her doctrines and dependency upon the Holy See, and in perfect communion with it. There are Greeks separated, who have no connection with the Holy See, and no connection with the Catholic Church, any more than Protestants have. But while there are these varieties, the vast majority, the immense preponderance of the inhabitants, profess the Catholic religion. Whole provinces know no other—Lombardy, the Tyrol, and Dalmatia, almost all of Austria Proper, a considerable portion of Hungary—so that if we take the empire altogether, we may call it a great Catholic empire, in which there are to be found some congregations of persons indeed, but only some and comparatively few, separated from the Catholic Church.\*

In England, on the other hand, the religion of the State is strictly confined to what is called the Anglican Church. In Scotland it is the Presbyterian Church, for in that part of Great Britain the law recognizes no communion with the Church of England ; and the presbyterianism of the one has nothing to do in the way of communion or jurisdiction with the prelacy of the other. Ireland, again, with a Catholic population, presents an anomaly unknown in any other part of the world ; being considered by the State as if it were Protestant. That is to say, although the people are Catholics, their religion is unrecognized, and the Protestant clergy, without flocks, are alone acknowledged by the State. Thus, then, in each of the three countries there is an Established Protestant Church ; out of which there grow an immense number of sects, calling themselves, and acknowledged as, Protestants. There are Protestant dissenters of various forms of worship or belief, and these form “denominations” or sects ; they are so numerous as almost to baffle designation, and it is impossible to attempt to describe them. Then there are the Catholics, who form

\* The population of the Austrian Empire was 37 millions, 583 thousands, according to the census of 1846. Of these, 26 millions, 375,000 were Latin Catholics ; 3 millions, 694,000 were United Greeks. Total Catholics, 30,069,000. Out of the remainder must be taken 729 thousand Jews. There are upwards of 3 millions of schismatical Greeks. The whole of the Protestants amount to 1 million, 286,000 Lutherans ; and 2 millions, 161,000 Reformed ; with 5000 Unitarians ; and about 2000 of other sects.—*Almanach de Gotha*, 1854.

a considerable body in England and Scotland, and in Ireland are the immense majority of the people. The State Church is therefore reduced to that portion of the people who are not Presbyterian, nor of some denomination of dissent, nor Catholics—not to speak of Jews and other non-christians. It forms comparatively, then, a small body but compact, and having its complete government recognized by the Crown. When we consider this body, which the State assumes to represent, and exclusively, the religion of the country—the sole authorized teacher of truth—the only means of communication between the State and the people in religious matters—the official conductor of grace from the high treasury of heaven to the humblest cottages of the land, the only one at least so acknowledged by the Government, for its sacraments alone are constitutionally recognized as such,—we might at least conclude that it must be necessarily a compact and united body. Yet you well know that I could not say such a thing seriously. You know that small as is this body, completely recognized as are its privileges, definite as is its position, it is yet rent and torn in pieces, as if within its bowels it had engendered a number of domestic enemies, that sought only how they might first destroy one another and then their common parent, knowing that when they had all perished, the mother also must be destroyed. They contend without mercy—High Church and Low Church, Puseyite and Evangelical, and the Broad Church, wishing to embrace them all. They contend about sacraments and about services, about altars, and about tables, about flowers, and about candles, about surplices, and about gowns; in fact, about everything, however trifling, or however tremendous, that regards religion. They contend about baptism and about the eucharist; whether the one is a ceremonial rite or a key to unlock heaven, and whether the other is a mere symbol, or the awful reality of the body of Christ. They contend about Church government, and about Church ritual; about the source of jurisdiction, and about the limits of the episcopal authority—nay, even about its necessity. In a word, they contend about everything, and there is not a single point of doctrine which they do not make matter of dispute. Nor is that all: they contend about the inspiration of the Bible; about the genuineness or authority of almost every book in the sacred volume; some publicly reject most of them, and treat them with ridicule; and the bishops allow them to preach and to teach in this way without, I will not say suspension, but without even censure or rebuke! And this is the Church of that country which pretends to teach other nations how to regulate theirs, and to bring light and peace to them! We, although our house is on fire, attempt to teach our neighbours how to put out that which we assume to be a flame, but which is, in fact, only a light! We pretend to be the counsellors of a united church, in which there is not the least dissent or discordance in doctrine, from the emperor upon the throne to the humblest cottager in his dominions; in which there is not a single prayer offered up in which all



could not join—not a single devotion in which all would not share ; a unity of worship springing from a perfect unity of faith, and resulting in a unity and harmony of religious feeling, from the highest to the lowest, among the Catholic millions ! We, who cannot keep together this small fragment of the nation which is called “ the Church,” cannot make it think alike, or even agree as to the measures by which peace could be restored to it ! We, in magisterial tones, trumpet forth to other nations how they ought to govern their Churches, how they should deal with their liturgies, or administer their ecclesiastical endowments ! Oh, surely the retort must be—“ Physician, cure thyself !” Set your own house in order, where there is confusion, and dissension, and disunion, and then try to give a lesson to a Catholic state, not how its Catholic subjects are to be brought into unity, for that has not been destroyed, not how they are to be restored to identity of faith, for it has never been lost or impaired, but how the external relations of the Church with the State are to be regulated ; how the outward operations of the Church are to be conducted, or the ministrations of the priesthood directed, or how the instruction of youth is to be managed ; how the elections to the episcopate are to be carried on, so as to secure the election of the best persons as bishops. Such is the scope of the Concordat : and we are indignant because a Church, united in itself, and understanding itself, legislates harmoniously, and comes to a conclusion which is adopted both by State and Church, the temporal and spiritual powers, in a Concordat which fully recognizes and fully secures the rights and privileges of each. Surely it is absurd in us thus to provoke the taunt :—“ Why do *you* not attempt a Concordat ?” Certainly it is *wanted* in this country ! I do not mean a concordat between this country and the Holy See. In fact, I ought not to use the term, which is sacred, and only properly applied to solemn treaties upon religious matters between a Catholic State and the Pontifical Chair. But do we not want “ articles of peace,” or of “ conformity ?”—some means of bringing about unity and harmony ? Every one feels it. Well, then, set about it ! You have a “ head of the Church,” with this advantage, that you have the same person also as head of the State, so that you have no difficulty about securing co-operation and unity between the head of the Church and the head of the State ; whereas with Catholics it is a matter of treaty and adjustment, and difficulties will arise, differences of opinions and discussions starting out of conflicts of interest, and requiring to be harmonized by mutual concession and stipulation. You have no need of all this ; you have a Sovereign who rules both Church and State, and with this union of the two authorities in the same person, it surely ought not to be difficult to bring the State Church, which thus owes a double duty of obedience to its head, into a condition of harmony and good understanding.

Let us however suppose for a moment that our gracious Queen,

choosing those counsellors whom the constitution has given to the Crown, by and with the advice and consent of Parliament, were to set forth for the purpose of putting an end to all these dissensions and disputes, a wise and liberal plan, which should give to the Church the nomination of its Bishops, and should give to the Prelates and the Clergy of lower rank, powers of self-reform, and self-legislation, which should take out of the dominion of the State so much patronage, and so much of that power of interference in matters ecclesiastical as is complained of, and should restore to the Church of England (as it is said) "her lost rights:" such an outcry would arise on the question as would make it impossible even for the great combined and concentrated power of the Crown to act with the slightest chance of success. The members of the Church would first dispute whether any change was required at all, and if so, in what matters; or in what manner; or by what measure. One would wish that more power might be taken from the Bishops, and more be given to the Crown: others would desire that the Crown should surrender some of its present power, and set the Bishops free: some would wish that the Bishops should be elected by the Lower Clergy: others would deprecate the idea of a popular election, as likely to introduce disorder, and occasion scandal: some would desire that the free power of election should be given to the Chapters: others would say that the Chapters are close bodies, who would exercise their power of choice in favor of persons of their own corporation:—In fact, I believe that the first point started would cause such differences of opinion and such opposition, that people would say at last; "better let things be as they are." There would be no agreement as to the points upon which change or settlement was necessary. Then again there would be the apprehension of restoring convocation, with the claims of the Lower Clergy on the one hand, and of the Laity on the other, for there are those who say that the laity have a right to form a part of convocation: and there are many who spurn the idea of the clergy having any power of self-management, without the control of the State. Now after all, after making convocation free, or adopting some other course to concoct a plan of reform and a change of organic law, nothing would avail until "the Commons of Great Britain" and "the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled" had determined what they deemed right, with regard to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The Queen could not effect the change without a Bill. And what an opposition there would be! what debates and deliberations! Not merely of members of the State Church: but Dissenters—Unitarians—even Infidels—(if there be any in those august assemblies)—all would oppose any measure for enlarging the power of the Church, or conceding to it the slightest freedom of action. Thus the question would be no further advanced than it was before. Session would go by after Session: bills would not be passed, or would be rejected: and the State Church would

be still what it is now, and what it is likely to remain, a congeries of opposite elements—something which one can only liken to an enormous mass of loose ends of ropes, attached to some huge piece of machinery, which no one dares to touch or to deal with, but is allowed to twirl round and twist itself to pieces, till it has worn itself out, or somehow destroyed itself. For no one will dare to meddle with this confused and unravelled portion of the State-machinery with the hope of making it move or blend harmoniously.

No ! this country, so justly proud of its privileges, and lofty in its many claims to preeminence—and at the same time so loud in its voice of censure, so decided in its expressions of disapproval of what is done abroad in ecclesiastical affairs—has no power whatever to deal with its own Church, so as to bring it into a condition of concord and peace ! What right then has it to be the teacher of others ? And can we be surprised, if fierce and scornful words spoken now, speedily pass away from the memory of foreign nations : descending as they do, not like the soft and gentle rain, which falls upon the grass and penetrates into the earth, but like drops of water cast upon hot iron, which, after fierce ebullition, end in sudden and complete evaporation ! In a few weeks another topic will arise, more striking or startling ; or, it may be, that he who has been so scornfully spoken of, and so bitterly censured, may turn out to be in a few months a useful mediator or a powerful ally ; and then those who have so calumniated him and so insulted him, will turn towards him to fawn upon and flatter him, as they have already done elsewhere.

Before I conclude, let me address a few more words to you, begging of you to take in a kindly spirit what I have said, and to allow some room for consideration ere you judge rashly on the topic before us. Remove from your minds those prejudices and that irritation which have been excited, in order that we may discuss the matter more calmly and justly.

It naturally occurs to any one who reflects upon the matter, to say, “ What business have we to interfere ? Let the Austrians judge for themselves ; they surely know their own interests best : why should we judge for them ? ” This must be met. It is answered in the usual way, by saying, “ There is great discontent in Austria against the *Concordat* : the clergy are disgusted with it.” Well, when we come to analyse this assertion we shall see what it is worth. It is as though we were told that those who had been shut up in prison, or had their limbs chained, were exceedingly angry at being let loose ! or persons crippled and maimed from their birth, after being restored to health, should feel that an injury had been inflicted upon them. It is said that the clergy of Austria are indignant at the *Concordat* ; that they protest against it ; that there is to be a great movement against it. Such prophecies are the easiest things upon earth ! There is no difficulty in making them : the difficulty lies in seeing them fulfilled. Perhaps the writer has heard

from one or two friends—(and remember that the Austrian Empire is of vast extent, embracing thousands of square miles and millions upon millions of people,)—probably he may have heard from some one at Vienna or elsewhere, that one or two persons had been heard in loose conversation to say that they were disgusted with the Concordat; then he rushes to the conclusion that all the clergy are discontented with it, that the Austrian Church is indignant at it. These prophecies are so easy and so safe, because something new arises in a few months to make people forget them; and no persons have such short memories as false prophets. They never come to you and say, “Remember that I told you there would be a great movement in Austria against this *Concordat*, and it has not taken place.” Oh no! You never have read such a confession in a newspaper. About this time last year,—next Saturday\* will be the anniversary of the great event—the Pope made what we considered one of the most magnificent definitions of doctrine that ever emanated from the Chair of St. Peter—the definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Then again (as though it any way affected Protestants, as though it called upon *them* to believe any thing,) they were not satisfied that we should settle our own affairs; there was one of those periodical explosions of Protestantism; the volcano burst, and broke forth in a sharp eruption which continued for some time. And what was then said? Confident assurances were given by our correspondents in every part of Europe, that there would be some protest against the doctrine from the bishops, or from the clergy, or from the laity, in every direction. Moreover it was said that we should speedily hear of large secessions from the Catholic Church in consequence of this definition of doctrine. Many have forgotten the prophecies, but we have not; and we ask, where has been their fulfilment? Has there been a single bishop who has protested against the definition, or a solitary priest—save indeed one, who died most sadly soon after, and whose pamphlet was quoted, and is still again and again by the anti-Catholic Journals, as if it spoke the sense of any portion of the Church? I mean the unfortunate Abbé Laborde. With that exception, there has not been a single protest against the definition; and the conduct of that poor man was so extraordinary, that it seems to have bordered on fanaticism, or rather to have been allied to insanity. He is about the only person who objected to the definition. It was everywhere received by the Church with joy. There has been a collection already made of accounts of the rejoicings consequent upon the publication of the definition in every part of the world. It was received with just as much joy in Mexico, Peru, and Chili, in the East Indies, or in North America, as it was in France, in Italy, in Germany, or in Spain, or in England or Ireland. Then as to secessions there, have been none; there may have been isolated instances of temporary

\* The Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the B. V. Mary.

anxiety or difficulty, but nothing like a secession : of a single parish, of a solitary village, I have not heard even of *one*. Yet it was the prophecy and the confident assurance, that there would be many such. And so now we are assured that the clergy of Austria are discontented with the Concordat; and it is prophecied that there will be movements against it. Wait and see whether these prophecies will be verified by the event!

Now, addressing myself to the Catholics present: I call upon them sincerely to thank God for having consoled his Church by this great measure, while he has afflicted her in many other places. It is always the way in the dealings of God's providence with His Church; when she seems to be losing ground on one side, and to be sinking under a heavy burden in one quarter of the globe, something comes to her relief, and she is full again of consolation and joy; as if to show that it is not an abandonment of her, that it is only a chastening, to keep us humble, and make us prove constant in perseverance and good works, that so we may draw down the blessing of God, each upon his own small portion of God's Church. We are bound to the Church by the strongest ties of sympathy. The Catholics of Austria are as much our brethren as those of America. It is not language and race; it is not civil institutions; it is not merely similarity of thought and sentiment; it is not only equality of progress in science and literature; it is not anything that belongs to this earth which constitutes the strength of those ties, and creates a tender bond of love between us: it is the Divine power which holds and knits us together in the unity of the faith, keeping close to the Pillar of Truth, embracing firmly the rock of Peter, on which alone, inflexibly and unconquerably, God rests his own eternal promise. It is this which not only unites us to the Centre of Life and Heat, but, by radiation, makes us communicate what we have received to every other portion of the Church, thence to receive it ourselves again, by virtue of our Christian communion.

I am sure therefore that you will join with me in expressing here publicly my thanks to Almighty God, for having given to the Church this proof of His watchfulness; for having given to our brethren in the vast Empire of Austria, this great consolation; especially for having filled with joy that paternal heart of Christ's Vicar, which knows of no distinction among His children, and which thinks of us as much as of them, and has shewn to us as much love and tenderness as it has just done towards Austria; which unites us in one common love, and gives us a common blessing, the pledge of that eternal benediction which God pours forth upon all faithful children of his Church!



FOUR  
ADVENT LECTURES,

ON

CONCORDATS,

DELIVERED AT ST. MARY'S, MOORFIELDS.

BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

---

LECTURE II.

---

LONDON: BURNS, 17, PORTMAN STREET; DOLMAN, 61, NEW  
BOND STREET; RICHARDSON, 147, STRAND; DUBLIN: J.  
DUFFY; PRESTON: E. BULLER; BRISTOL: AUSTIN & JAMES;

And by order of all Booksellers.

---

1855.





## FOUR LECTURES, ETC.

---

### LECTURE II.

---

It is most gratifying to me to be met by such a large assemblage, who, I sincerely believe, are actuated by the desire of hearing and honestly considering what may be addressed to them on a subject, at this moment, of considerable public interest. I commenced a series of Discourses upon it on Sunday last under the general title of Concordats, intending more particularly to treat of that one particular instrument bearing this name, which is most prominently now before the public. And I trust that all who are about to hear me, have taken pains to read, if they did not hear, that first lecture. It is most important to approach a subject like this with minds free from prejudice, and from the excitement which has been raised upon it. Even though what I mean to say this evening may produce, as I trust it will, a favourable impression on you, I shall not consider it complete unless you join to it the explanations already given. Indeed it is necessary in continuing this subject, that I should recall the observations which I made near the close of my last lecture; as the arguments upon which I am about to enter, may be considered as a continuation of those remarks.

I endeavoured to draw a faint sketch of the religious situation of that Church which is alone recognized by the legislature and government of this country. I endeavoured to shew how much it stands in need of a Concordat; how necessary it has become to adjust the disputes, or rather the dissensions and quarrels, which are tearing it in pieces. I observed that it was in the power of the Crown of this country, singularly beyond what is in the power of any other Sovereign of Europe, to decide upon and make a final settlement of all religious differences; because the Crown of this realm is the only one which unites in itself in the same degree the headship of the State with that of the Church; and consequently the conflicting interests so difficult to harmonise in other States, may be considered as in the hands of one person, and it is therefore easier to make an amicable adjustment. The only conclusion I then asked you to draw from this picture was, that while the Church of this country was in such a state, and while moreover, in spite of these facilities,

obstacles existed which would probably prove insuperable, were any attempt made such as I have described,—it is neither prudent nor sensible,—nay, it is exposing ourselves to ridicule, to pretend to instruct others, how they are to adjust, I will not say differences, but difficulties, which may arise from the various interests which must be consulted, in a great national Church. For it must seem impertinent to go into another person's house, to set it in order for him, while our own is in utter confusion. But it was not my intention to make that the last consequence to be drawn from the picture which I placed before you ;—a picture of domestic and religious dissension. For now I will suppose a conclusion exactly the reverse of that which I drew. Instead of enumerating the obstacles which would make the attempt finally to settle church questions among us impossible, I will suppose that the attempt were made, and with success ; I will suppose that a pliant and obliging Parliament invested the Crown with the fullest power to act, and that thus by constitutional means, a new, complete, and, to England, satisfactory arrangement was made of the claims of its establishment, of the distribution of its parts, and their connection with the State. Let us even suppose that the public satisfaction was complete upon every point. For instance, the power of naming the bishops, is now vested in the Crown, but subject to many forms that mimic a canonical election, permission being given to the Chapter to choose, but with the obligation of electing the person who is pointed out by the Crown, and who is presumed to be the choice of the Church over which he is about to rule ; suppose that all these formalities were abolished, and the nomination of the bishops were directly vested in the Crown through the agency of one of the Ministers of State. Suppose, still further, there should be regulations issued as to the education of the clergy, by which it was commanded that they be inhibited from all studies which did not strictly belong to Protestantism ; that the Bible, and the Bible only, should form the course of theology to be taught in either of the Universities ; so that the monuments and writings of antiquity should not, even for a moment, be allowed to be explained or commented upon, or perhaps even referred to or quoted. Add to this a fair and enlarged reformation of the liturgy, and the administrations of the sacraments of the Church of England. Let every word be expunged from the Prayer-book which may give offence ; let the answers in the Catechism be altered, that any conscientious Dissenter may make them without scruple ; give to every one his choice, whether or no he will be subject to the injunctions of the rubrics ;—as for instance whether or no he will have the sign of the cross made in the baptism of his family, or whether he will assist or not at certain services. Let all be as fair as possible, that so the Church may be relieved from all exclusiveness ; let it be as wide as possible in the amplitude of its embrace, that thus it may increase the number of its subjects. Finally, let it be provided that there

shall be no education provided by the State, which acknowledges this Church alone, except what is based on the principles of Protestantism; and let the fair and unbiassed individual judgment of each one be made the paramount tribunal by which his religious convictions shall be decided. Do all this; I will suppose it done. What would you say if on a document containing such a system being issued, the whole Press of the continent should arise in a ferment of indignation, and almost of terror? I say, *suppose* this were so, for it certainly would not be;—there is a far better feeling in regard to these matters abroad, than there is here. When important decisions, which were in the eyes of Catholics most painful, I might say pitiable, have been made in this country, there has been no agitation, no excitement. When the celebrated decision on baptismal regeneration went forth to all the world, you might have looked in vain through a great portion of the continental Press to find a notice of it. The religious journals mourned that such a theological decision should have been pronounced in a Christian country; but they spoke of it with calmness, and merely as became persons relating what had taken place among others, and not what concerned themselves. Certainly there were no reviling epithets applied to those who took a part in that decision, for there is a natural good breeding abroad that would restrain men from using harsh and opprobrious terms when speaking of those in a high position, which entitles them to the reverence, the love, and the loyalty of millions. But suppose the people of the Continent were to assume a high tone and say: “Why, this new settlement of ecclesiastical matters in England, is undoing whatever was Catholic about its Church, and making it more Protestant. It is insupportable in our view; such a way of dealing with the English church, cannot be looked at by us without indignation. A short time ago that church seemed to be proceeding straight towards unity with the Catholic church; the principles there taught, and its ruling views were so tinged with Catholicity, that hundreds and thousands were led by them near enough by a single step to pass over the barrier that separated them; and we had hopes that she would one day re-enter the communion of the Catholic church.”

Now what answer would be made by Englishmen to such complaints? Surely, first there would be a natural surprise and indignation that they could not be supposed to arrange their own affairs without the intervention of others. But there would be more: it would be said, “Did these men think that the formation or settlement of our church was to be made on Catholic principles? Were they so foolish as to imagine that a Protestant church would naturally improve its own constitution by borrowing the principles of Catholics? Why we rejoice at the impression made on them, that we have Protestantized our church more completely; that we have removed from it what was considered of an anti-Protestant tendency;

that we have destroyed the temptations and allurements which have led so many away from their own church, and induced them to join that of Rome. What has been done here, must be judged by Protestant principles. For, as we are a Protestant church, it is a praise to be told that we have made the church more than ever Protestant, and less than ever Catholic."

In like manner then, I say, this Concordat is to be judged by Catholic, not by Protestant principles? It is not right to say, "We are indignant at the Concordat, because it acknowledges the power of the Pope so strongly." Why Catholics acknowledge that power: and when the Emperor made up his mind that the church of Austria required a new settlement, he did not ask Protestants the principles upon which it should be made. He sought those principles of course in his own church, and in his own faith: and you have no right to judge the measure, except in conformity with the religious principles professed by him. If you say, that the ecclesiastical law, and the relations between the church and state previously were more gratifying to our popular Protestant feeling, because the power of the Pope was curbed, the episcopacy humbled, and the church placed in complete subjection to the state, I ask in reply, are these Catholic, or Protestant principles? They please you, not because they are Catholic, but because they are Protestant. And do you suppose that a Catholic king, wishing to establish his church upon a stable basis, would take what would please Protestants as the principle of the reform, or change that had to be made? Or shall not Catholics say, as you would have said in a similar case; "Your complaints are only a compliment which you pay us; for you disapprove of what has been done, because you think it has made Austria more than ever Catholic; because it binds her more closely to the centre of Catholic unity; because it has secured her more against the introduction of heterodox instruction, and given her a more solid system of religious education; because it has prevented the dangers of that tendency which has prevailed in a great portion of Germany, and led many down the inclined plane of German Protestantism over the precipice of German rationalism, or scepticism.

This brings us to the real state of the question. What I have to do is to justify the Concordat, not upon Protestant, but upon Catholic principles; to show you how expedient, how admirable, and even how necessary it was, when so considered. The establishment of this principle will occupy me during the remainder of this lecture; and it will be, although not striking, yet, I trust, sufficiently interesting from the nature of the subject, and the connection it must have with whatever is to follow.

In looking for true principles about the Church, we must necessarily seek them where they are first recorded, in the words of Him who established it. We must go to the New Testament, to see what was our blessed Saviour's teaching respecting the condi-

tion of His Church in the world. What do we find concerning the rights of sovereigns over the Church? or concerning the mutual relations between the Church and the State? In the 13th chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, he expands that simple and beautiful principle of our Lord's, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's": I say simple and beautiful, as were all the words emanating from His mouth, because, however briefly they might be expressed, they contained the *germ* of the most perfect doctrine upon every subject, and are capable of indefinite expansion. When the apostle exhorts the Christians at Rome to obey all constituted authorities, he tells them to be subject to the powers that are, as coming from God,—for that all constituted authority, in fact, comes from Him; that therefore they must be obedient to the laws of the land, and be obedient to them not merely through servile fear, but for conscience's sake; that they must give tribute to whom tribute was due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor. They were to remember that the civil magistrate carried the sword for the punishment of malefactors, and that if they wished to escape from his just doom, they must do what was right. These were the principles of total and complete allegiance laid down by the apostle, in explaining the simple words of our Lord, "Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Who were the Cæsars,—the rulers who carried the sword, the powers to whom tribute and custom was due? The heathen sovereigns of the whole world. The providence of God, while on the one hand it had prepared the field for sowing the seed of the faith in unity, by giving almost the whole of the then habitable world to one race of sovereigns, at the same time made the position of the Church more decisive and more difficult by this very circumstance. The Christians could not say, "The sword is unsheathed against us here; we are persecuted at Rome; our blood flows in this country; but there is a neighbouring kingdom which will receive us and allow us to dwell in peace; let us retire there, let us live in quiet, with every advantage for establishing the Church which is committed to our care." It was impossible; the word of Christ was to be preached, and His religion was to be established, under the shadow of that persecuting sword. He launched the frail bark of His Church upon the wide waters, and gave it no point of attachment to the earth; he provided it with no wide harbours, with no sheltered ports, in which it could find rest amidst the billows; but left it unconnected with the kingdoms of earth, with any civil rule—unconnected by ties of earthly attachment or hope.

And did our blessed Saviour once hint, in giving His instructions to the Apostles, that there would ever be a different condition? Did He say, that after three hundred years the Church would be in a new state of existence? Did he say, "Then the words which I have spoken to you will no longer be applicable to your condition.

When I said to you, 'Ye shall be brought before kings and princes for my sake, and suffer persecution,' I only meant this to apply to three hundred years, during which you will be racked, and tortured, and put to death, but after that time you shall stand before kings and princes to be honored and caressed, to be favored and cherished"? No: everything that our blessed Lord said, or that has been recorded of His sayings, respecting the position of His faithful ones in the world, contemplated the actual state of the world. He founded the Church as a persecuted Church, and He instructed it as a persecuted Church. The lessons He gave it were not lessons for peace, riches, and greatness, for social position and prosperity, but lessons for abjection, scorn, hatred, persecution, adversity and death. He never even shadowed forth a different state. While He provided rules for its conduct while in this state which alone He described, He provided it with no rules whatever for another condition, in which it should be protected and favoured by royal power. Then what must we conclude, but that our blessed Saviour meant the organization of His Church to be perfect and complete, without the smallest contact with the civil power? As He made His Church so to exist for three hundred years, He built it, not such that it would fall to pieces after that time, but so that it might have continued in the same state for a thousand years more. And, even after all it may seem to have suffered during so many ages, were persecution to rise again, and were the State in every part of Europe to cut off the Church from its protection, and once more to leave it to its own resources, the edifice would be found as strong, as able to resist the most violent assaults, and to govern itself, as during the three first centuries; and the bark of Peter would be found to float upon the waves, and to bear its sacred charge as triumphantly as when its divine Master was seated in it upon the Sea of Genesareth.

This therefore is the Catholic principle upon the subject: the Church is an institution founded by our Blessed Lord without the least reference to the temporal power, having all resources for its perfect existence complete within itself, and prepared for an existence totally unconnected with any other rule.

Not only is this to be shown by the silence of Scripture; but it is still more perfectly revealed in the belief and practice of the Church itself. If you will read the works of the Fathers, who preceded the peace of the Church under Constantine, I doubt if you will find one single passage or expression which speaks of a hope that one day the Emperor should be a Christian, and the Church enjoy a different state to what it then was in: while on the other hand, there is not a single sentiment of sorrowing, or repining, or idea of rebellion: and there is not—even in pagan history—a solitary charge against the Christians of conspiracy against the Emperor who held that cruel sword of persecution in his hand. While the greatest and even most learned of statesmen and philosophers were cut off, one after the other, on the

charge of conspiracy against the Emperors, this was not the calumny which the heathens breathed against the Christians. They were loyal and faithful to the State, in all that belonged to the duties of subjects. They fought in its armies: they fought not merely singly but in legions—under captains, and tribunes, and generals, who professed the Christian faith, and who after they had won a victory, rather than sacrifice the oblation of triumph, made themselves victims; and laid down their lives for a faith which forbade them to practice idolatry. They were faithful to their duties as subjects. They even taunted the heathen thus:—"If you want to know who are the most faithful subjects: if you want to know who pay the taxes, the tributes, the imposts and the customs, most willingly and most cheerfully, ask your tax-gatherers, and they will tell you—the Christians." And while they were thus loyal and so unrepining, they never (as I observed before,) breathed even a hope that the day would come, when the Emperor would be a Christian and the cross be enthroned upon his diadem. So far was this from being a dominant idea, or an expectation of the Christians during the first three centuries, as necessary for the development of their state, that they never appeared to expect greater honor even for the worship of God, more gorgeous ceremonies, or more splendid rituals, or a public worship celebrated with imperial magnificence. Visions like these which perhaps have floated often in the minds of persecuted Catholics in modern days, seem never to have disturbed for a moment the peace and contentment, with which they received the lot that God had appointed them. They appear to have deemed it the natural and normal state of the Church: they looked not to the future, but to the day which God had given them in which to work out their own salvation. And when the day for the liberation of the Church came, we find no exultation among the Christians, nor do we find the Fathers speak of the days that had gone by as days of misery and wretchedness from which God had snatched them. They looked back rather with holy envy upon those who had been exposed to suffer and had enjoyed the privilege of dying for Christ: nor do we find them boasting or assuming any superiority over those who had not embraced Christianity. On the contrary, they accepted the change which had come to them in the same spirit as the previous condition of the Church had been embraced by their forefathers in the faith.

What results from this? That we cannot find a trace of the idea that the real position of the Church was one in which there was to be a connection between it and the State, and to have rights secured to it by the civil power. There was at the beginning no expectation of a time to come, when such rights should be secured.

Was the Church then founded like a seed cast into the furrow, waiting for the genial spring before it should come forth and open, and grow up, and expand and produce its flowers and fruit! On the contrary, it was in that state of pure detachment from the world,

that the Church grew up to its highest perfection, and developed every part of its system.

You cannot imagine the growth of a tree,—that from a seed thrown into the ground has sprung up and extended on every side, bearing not only leaves but flowers and fruit,—more complete than the corresponding fullness of expansion and maturity that had been wrought in the Church, during those first three hundred years of entire disconnection from the world and its rulers. Its bishoprics covered the whole earth. It was divided into Provinces, with their Archbishoprics and Patriarchates, which had already grown up and formed around them subordinate centres of unity. Relations existed between all these different parts, so that intercommunion was going on throughout. There were priests and inferior orders: there were virgins consecrated to God in abundance: there were holy men who had retired from the world into solitude seeking God: there were ecclesiastical laws and canons, and a penitential system, and rules of discipline which were (more or less) the same all over the world. Then there were Liturgies, which in all essential particulars were identical throughout, though written in different languages—with innumerable rites and ceremonies. All this came forth and grew up and enlarged and extended itself during these three hundred years, when the State had no interest nor power whatever in the action of the Church. So that not only did our Blessed Redeemer establish His Church independent of, and unconnected with the State, but he had evidently given it an energy and vitality which was equal to all its emergencies, and it had actually grown up into the fullest vigour and maturity during that time of suffering.

Could anything have been done more completely to prove that the Church, in herself had no necessary connection with the world, and could go on for ever without it, if such were the will of God? But there was one doctrine which Catholics hold, which forms the necessary and binding foundation to the whole ecclesiastical system. The whole of the Church, separated not only by space but by speech, agreed by a communion which was not that of an inorganic body which may touch other bodies, on one point or another—but that of organic life, in which all the parts have a vital coherence and mutual action. The centre and source of that life was in him who succeeded the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter. During these ages, dispersed as are their monuments and scanty their histories, or rather fragments of histories, we can see throughout, that subordination to one Power, the consulting of one oracle, of that Power which binds and looses, that holds the keys of the kingdom of heaven that is constituted the Rock upon which the fabric of the Church is founded, and has its root, the written Word of God. For we can trace the existence of this power, jurisdiction, and supreme authority, to him who handed it down to his successors—to him who



was the Rock on which the Church was built, to whom were given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to whom was said "Feed my sheep"—and who was thus appointed to rule as Christ's Vicar upon earth, with the universal power of binding and loosing. The Church, built on this foundation, was thus provided with a principle of internal unity, which made her able to exist in complete organization, without the external assistance of civil power.

Now all this is the more remarkable when we consider that God, in whose hands are the hearts of princes—and who made Augustus Cæsar issue a decree which laid the very foundation of Christianity in the fulfilment of the first of the prophecies, by bringing the mother of His Son, the ever Blessed and Immaculate Virgin to Bethlehem, there to give Him birth, could just as easily have touched the Emperor's heart, and made him go forth like the kings of the East, an imperial pilgrim, to visit that humble shrine: and he might have been led not only to give "gold, frankincense and myrrh," but the whole earth and the religion of the world. It pleased God however to delay the hour for three hundred years.

And now the Church was fully organized: and so in possession of every spiritual right. What could give any portion of that right to any Emperor? Whence could he receive it? Was it given to him in the New law? It had, indeed, been prophesied that "Kings should be the nursing fathers and Queens the nursing mothers of the Church." But that did not constitute jurisdiction and authority. Where was it predicted, that Kings not only should be protectors of the Church and act in amicable relations with her, but that whenever a King should arise who also was a Christian, the Pope who then exercised the jurisdiction of the Apostles, without reference to any earthly power, should cede a share of it to him, and that he should exercise it in his stead. Show me the Charter of the rights of royalty in religion! Not a word, not a hint, not an intimation, either in the word of God or in the belief and expectation of the Church. They had been faithful subjects to the heathen emperor, and were as ready to be faithful to a Christian one; but beyond that there was nothing in their organization which provided for a change. There was nothing in the delivery to them of their power which provided for any communication of it to him. But it was impossible that such a change in the political and social state could exist without new combinations, consequently new arrangements, arising. We are accustomed so much to hear churchmen spoken of as "ambitious men," who are always endeavouring to gain political power and to attain high positions, that writers almost unconsciously carry the notion through every age, and take it for granted that all at once the liberated Church began to usurp such power, and thus made itself subject to the State. Now the truth is that it was the State which had need of the Church. Remember, that when Constantine became Christian, he did not bring the empire after him. Possibly some about his court, may through that spirit of flattery

which is too common, have followed him, and taken without conviction the name of Christians. But it is certain that the population of the empire remained for a long time strictly addicted to Paganism ; which indeed that very word tells us, for the Christians began to call the heathens "pagans," or villagers, because the rural population remained so long in their heathenism after the great cities had become Christian. The Empire then was still heathen. And in what a condition ! All who have read history know that it was in a fearful state of immorality and degradation. The whole population of that heathen empire had sunk and sunk, even while there were some artificial aid of literature and taste to sustain the appearance of virtue : all good learning, even sophistry itself, had declined lower and lower, and all enlightenment had disappeared, so that the people were immersed in a state of ignorance and vice truly appalling.

At this time the Emperor became Christian : and the first thought of a truly Christian Emperor must have been not merely to convert, but to humanize his subjects. He must have wished to raise them from the state in which they were, and make them less vicious and corrupt. Now what an admirable organization he finds through the whole of his Empire ! In every city, in every town, almost in every village, he finds a bishop ; a man who has been chosen out of the members of a religion he knows to be pure and holy ; and distinguished even among them for the innocence of his life and the brightness of his example. He is a man incorruptible in the midst of a corrupt population, and holding high principles of Christian responsibility, which teach him that not even in thought must he offend the law of God ; he is a man who has studied and become learned, from the necessities of his position ; he is accustomed to decision, if not upon civil, upon religious matters ; he is accustomed to deliberate and decide upon great questions ; to award rewards and punishments to his clergy ; a man of unflinching steadiness in his principles, for he has just passed through a crisis, when to be a Bishop was to be marked for an object of slaughter ; nay, he is perhaps maimed, he has lost an eye, or he halts in his gait, because he has been wounded by the persecutors on account of his religion,—for so some of the Bishops were who came to the first General Council ; he is a man who has been accustomed to administration, having goods of his Church, which even in the times of persecution had become considerable ; he is already accustomed to civil decisions, for the precept of St. Paul had been observed carefully by the early Christians, of not carrying their causes before profane tribunals, but judging them among themselves. Now upon the Emperor becoming Christian, he finds a man of this character in every town, almost in every village, with a body of clergy his counsellors and supporters. Is it possible that the Emperor should not seek aid from that organization, already prepared in the Church, by which he may direct, amend and purify his state ? Such was the Christian Church. It was the civil government that

sought out the bishops, and charged them with temporal duties as the fittest men to discharge them. Thus so early as the year 368, we have a decree of Valentinian I, and Valens desiring the bishops to take under their peculiar inspection all persons engaged in trade, in order to see that frauds were not committed, to prevent them, or to punish them. Again in the year 409, we have Theodosius and Honorius decreeing that the defender of each town (that is one of the highest magistrates in that age, for the defence of the town against the irruptions and invasions of barbarian tribes), should be elected by the bishop in an assemblage of the clergy and notables of the town; that their election should then be canvassed, and if thought right, confirmed by the freeholders and burghers, and then ratified by the supreme power. This is an early instance of that municipal spirit, which then latent, was destined to take a more definite form in the middle ages. The Justinian code which forms the basis of the civil law of all Christian Europe, increased greatly the temporal duties of the bishops. It gave them the care of all prisoners, slaves, and orphans. See how the charity of the Church began to make itself known in favour of the distressed, who in ancient pagan times received only harshness and cruelty; they were put under the bishop, and it was his duty to watch over them. Then the bishop had also to take care of the weights and measures, and see that they were just; he was in council with other important persons in the town to superintend all public works; finally, all laws were to be promulgated through the bishop, and it was his duty to report to the government all judges guilty of any unjust conduct. Much temporal authority, and jurisdiction in the things of the world was thus thrust on the bishops by the laws of the state; and this additional burthen was put upon them because they were the fittest persons in those times to be charged with such important duties. A few years later, in the year 412, we are told by the ecclesiastical historian of that period, Socrates, that St. Cyril, as Patriarch of Alexandria, had the office committed to him of Governor of the whole province of Egypt, and the Pope in Rome had a similar delegation for that part of the empire. Here then we see connections springing up between the Church and the State, which arose on the part of the State, by its wishing to make use of the agency of the Church for the welfare of the people.

On the other hand, it is clear that the Church had need of temporal assistance; not however to provide it with endowments,—for through the charity of the faithful, even in those times of persecution, the Church had not been badly provided for. Here let me observe, that while in the last great persecution under Diocletian, most of the ecclesiastical property had been seized and confiscated, Constantine, on coming to the throne, ordered that it should be all restored, but with this understanding, that he would indemnify, out of the public treasury, those who were possessed of it; so that no odium should come upon the Church from the restoration. I notice this noble act, be-

cause it is so similar to one of the articles in the present Concordat which has raised most reproach and obloquy. But the Church had need of the State for the operation of its power, which the spread of error rendered necessary. It was almost impossible, when communications by sea and land were so difficult, when it was not even easy to send a letter from Europe to Asia, to secure a convocation of the bishops of Europe, Asia, and Africa, the whole of the civilized globe; it was indeed almost impossible without the assistance of the State. It was necessary therefore, to have the concurrence of the civil power, in order to assemble a general council.

By degrees, the Church's position being recognized in the State, there fell upon it duties which brought it in contact with the civil magistrates, and there would be, in many parts of the empire, men who did not recognize the Church, and even heathen governors, who sought indirectly to trammel and embarrass the action of the episcopacy. Hence the protection of the emperors, or even their interference would be frequently called for. If time served, I could have read to you such a number of passages from the declarations of emperors, and from the assertions of bishops, as would satisfy you that at that time the limits and broad boundary-marks of power of the emperor were recognized; that he could not exercise spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and that the bishops pretended to no sort of civil rights beyond those that were conferred by the State. The Church at the rails of the sanctuary, said to the emperor, "This is the boundary, within this presume not to set your foot." And the emperors acknowledged again and again this complete severance of the two powers, which did not disturb that harmony existing in the whole empire; and the Church and State became so interlaced intimately one with the other, that while the State lent its support and assistance to the Church, as the elm does to the vine,—the more graceful and richer of the two, though in nature the weaker plant,—the latter shed around its support all its beauties, and no small portion of its fruit. Concessions were thus mutual. It would have been harsh and unnatural in the Church not to have shown deference, or even not to have transferred some portion of that with which it could part, to those who had been its gracious and valorous defenders. And hence, there were concessions—they were strictly so—they were not rights of the State. Never did the State set up the right to control the ecclesiastical action, dogmatical definition, or the administration of purely religious duties. It was not until centuries after, that difficulties upon this subject arose and were fomented; it was about the time of the conquest of this country by the Normans. About that period here as on the continent there arose those differences, which led to the murder of our own St. Thomas, and to the banishment of some of our most illustrious prelates to end their days in a foreign land. There were questions into which it is unnecessary

now to enter, questions as to investitures, or the right of the crown to give to the bishops emblems which the civil power affected to consider emblems of temporalities, but in which the Church saw the beginning of an usurpation of purely spiritual rights. When these questions arose, they soon led to a disastrous separation between the two powers which had hitherto been in amicable action. No doubt when the contest sprung up, it was connected with considerations of feudality and with the rights of lords over their vassals; but still it became too plain that temporal sovereigns desired to have the bishops so far subject to them, as that they should not be able to exercise spiritual jurisdiction without their approbation. And though these questions had been in great measure allayed, and feuds had abated for some time, yet the seeds were already cast of that terrible schism which turned entirely upon this question, whether sovereigns had, of their own right, dominion over the Church; whether they could make and unmake bishops; whether, in their own realms they were independent of all spiritual jurisdiction exercised from without. It was upon this claim that Henry VIII separated himself and his kingdom from the Holy See, and upon the foundation of this error was built up the whole system of the Reformation that followed. It was tenacity of the power to dominate the Church, which formed the great feature, not only in the first separation under Henry, but of the subsequent separation under Elizabeth, who claimed the power of "unfrocking," as she called it, any of her bishops.

Now here comes a clear distinction and separation between the Catholic principle of church government, and that which has been adopted by Protestant states. The Catholic has not changed in one single point. He believes that the Church is now as truly independent of secular jurisdiction in what relates to her organization, her teaching, her whole system, as she was during the three first centuries of persecution. He does not believe that any part of ecclesiastical authority passed at any time to the Crown, or that the power given to St. Peter has been transferred to a secular potentate; or that one single change has been made in the source or the organization and administration of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is the characteristic and essential question between the two; and while we maintain, that, whatever has been taken by sovereigns, or the state of power over the Church, is a usurpation, we do not quarrel with those who have adopted this principle, and acted upon it, if they carry it out to its fullest extent. But we say, "Let us act on our principles as you act upon yours." For from what I have said, it follows, that whatever the civil rule is, the state has no divine warrant for granting jurisdiction, or for its limitation or execution; but whatever it receives from the Church's natural adaptation to the exterior and civil conditions surrounding it, is a concession from that power that originally possessed it.

Hence if you come and say, here is a Church that wants a new organization—here is England, of which the Catholic portion has no Episcopacy (of course I speak of a past time,)—here is another country, Holland, which does not possess a suitable system of Episcopacy; there is the Catholic church in America, which is in want of spiritual rulers; there are other countries, Portugal, Spain, Austria, which feel a lesser want, and think that the system existing requires from circumstances to be modified: how shall the question be dealt with? Shall the Catholics of England meet together and say, “We will have bishops; we will have them after our own form and choice; we will name them in such and such a way”? If they do so, they cease to be Catholic; because; as Catholics hold that our Saviour granted the power of establishing ecclesiastical jurisdiction only to the successor of St. Peter, the moment you abandon that principle of unity, you cease to be Catholic; and therefore there is an end of the question. They have then no resource but to go to the throne of St. Peter’s successor, there lay their humble entreaty at his feet, and ask him to grant them a Hierarchy with such conditions as he thinks fit. He could, for instance, at once appoint bishops of his own selection, and every Catholic would receive them with humble gratitude, and kiss their hands in token of veneration and submission to their office and their jurisdiction. Then if, instead of direct nomination from the Holy See among the Catholics of England, there are chapters which have the duty of selecting certain persons, and sending their names to the Holy See; is that a right, or is it a concession? It is clear, that while the Holy See reserves to itself the right of appointment and nomination, it concedes this preliminary, so as to let them make a first choice, and guide its judgment without diminishing its rights. So it graciously yields what it can grant. But it could not grant an absolute right, except as a mere revocable concession. And what applies to us, applies also elsewhere. If the Pope in Ireland granted the right to the parish priests, of a form of election, not known in any other portion of the Church, it is clear that this is a concession. They do not pretend to hold it from any one but him; he has made over to them a portion of the jurisdiction which belonged to him.

What then is to be the course if a Catholic Emperor or King who wishes to establish the church in his realms upon a truly orthodox and Catholic basis? You might imagine from what has been written that he should say, “I will make bishops without any communication with the Pope; I will create a Church-system of my own without consulting the Holy See.” No doubt the Emperor might have said so; but he would not have acted on Catholic principles. One would imagine that what persons in England expected was, that the Emperor of Austria would have made a Concordat on Protestant principles. Surely that is a manifest error in judgment. It was necessary for him to go to the Holy See; it was necessary to arrange

with the Holy See. What is the circumstance which has given most offence in this Concordat? Perhaps this, that the Holy Father in his allocution on the subject, spoke of what he had granted to the piety of his dear son, to whom he has made certain concessions. It was pretended to have been a discredit to the Emperor to accept any thing in the form of a concession. Why, he could accept it in no other way, he could have it in no other form. If he or any other Catholic prince—(I make of course an impossible supposition,—for in this case the monarch has been brought up in solid principles of faith and virtue)—but if he or any other sovereign had imagined that he would not admit these things as concessions, he would at once have maintained that the State is the source of episcopal jurisdiction. For whatever may have been speculatively taught by Gallicans, as they are called, there has never been a bishop who would maintain that any one could be a Bishop and exercise jurisdiction in spite of the Holy See. Such a one would have been certainly a schismatic, and probably a heretic too. Thus the whole Concordat, in its general principles, is what it must necessarily have been. What it is in its details and its articles, is matter for further enquiry. There was no other way of proceeding; there was no other way of describing points given up to the crown, but under the name of concession. It is not merely a treaty, it is not as if the Emperor yielded rights of his crown to the Pope and the Pope granted something in return; but whatever regards ecclesiastical matters, if given to the State, is a simple and voluntary grant on the part of the Holy See, who is satisfied thus to reward the piety of that prince, who has so well secured, by the provisions of the Concordat, the welfare of his people, and the improvement and advancement of ecclesiastical interests. Let us then remember, that in examining this Concordat, we must be content to examine it as a document intended to place on a satisfactory basis, the Catholic Church of a Catholic State; and that, consequently, from the beginning to the end, we must not expect to find in it a word which can be repugnant to Catholic doctrine; that if the object of a Concordat be, after years of experience, to improve the state and condition of the Church, it will not have the effect of going more in the direction of Protestantism, but must proceed necessarily in the direction of a high Catholic standard, not of truth, but of discipline and organization. It would be folly to say, "We wish to make a new Concordat, because the last was unsatisfactory," and then to ask the Pope to make it less satisfactory than it had been before. It was clearly incompatible with the duties and feelings of Catholics, to attempt to improve by departing from Catholic principles.


Such then is the basis which I have laid down for the examination of this important document. Yet I will not promise you, that even in the next lecture I shall enter into its examination in detail.

Its history, with reference to what led to its existence, demands notice, while there are other matters connected with the form of this document which it will be useful to explain. For although Concordats have been made and renewed with the Holy See by almost every state in Europe, within the last half-century, their meanings and their provisions have not been well understood in this country, and in this particular case it is necessary to be acquainted with the religious state of the country, in order to see the necessity that arose for this new Concordat.

I shall indeed be abundantly repaid if a certain number of candid enquirers are led to believe that after all there has been nothing to alarm, and not a little to approve. I think that when you come to examine the details of the Austrian Concordat, you will see that its object is different from what has been publicly represented, and that the working of it is likely to advance many principles which the people of this country have much at heart. I think also that you will find, that instead of this being a retrograde step in the religious world of Europe, it is pregnant with great advantages, and will secure the people in general many benefits of which they had been deprived. It is by honestly and ardently endeavouring to search to the very bottom of what forms the groundwork of a popular opinion, that prejudice will be removed. And it will be indeed consoling to me if the kind attention with which you have listened to me, shall not be unaccompanied with some fruit. I entreat you to continue to the end this gratifying attention ; and, either to read or to listen to the whole of the series. Perhaps thus a little oil will be thrown on the waters, and we may celebrate the festival of our blessed Redeemer's coming into this world as the Prince of Peace ; and give glory to God, and peace to men of good will, by sentiments of mutual concord and universal charity and love.







FOUR

ADVENT LECTURES,

ON

CONCORDATS,

DELIVERED AT ST. MARY'S, MOORFIELDS.

BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

---

LECTURE III.

---

LONDON: BURNS, 17, PORTMAN STREET; DOLMAN, 61, NEW  
BOND STREET; RICHARDSON, 147, STRAND; DUBLIN: J.  
DUFFY; PRESTON: E. BULLER; BRISTOL: AUSTIN & JAMES;

And by order of all Booksellers.

---

1855.

**W. DAVY & SON, Printers, 8, Gilbert Street, Oxford Street.**

# FOUR LECTURES, ETC.

---

## LECTURE III.

---

IN my last Lecture I endeavoured to show you that the judgment to be passed upon an important document such as a treaty of a religious character between the Holy See and the Sovereign of a great Empire, should be a judgment not according to the private views or principles of any body religious or civil,—different from those of the contracting parties, but strictly in accordance with the principles which they profess; in other words, that the Concordat lately concluded between the Holy See and the Emperor of Austria, must be examined upon Catholic grounds, and judged of entirely by Catholic principles. The principle which I laid down as the basis of Catholic reasoning upon this important subject was this—that our Blessed Lord designed, directed, and organized His Church without the slightest reference to any compact with the civil, except as an adverse power: that He framed it so that in the course of three hundred years of the most cruel persecution, her whole system was established: her hierarchy formed, her laws promulgated, her worship uniformly arranged, so that the whole world, so far as it was Christian, was in complete unity, and had a system as perfect within itself as that which it has any where developed under apparently more favourable circumstances. The Church, in other words, was complete, before she came to have any dealings whatever with the state.

Now from this perfect organization of the Church during these three past centuries, there resulted necessarily *rights*. A body which is organized cannot exist without rights. There must be mutual dependencies between its different parts. There must be on the one hand, a power to rule, to govern, direct, and legislate; while on the other there must be an obligation of obeying and practising that which is commanded. Let us illustrate this by two or three familiar points.

Our Blessed Saviour said of His followers, that if any of them would not receive a private correction, they were to be denounced to the Church—"Go, tell the Church."\* The Church is a body therefore, able to receive an accusation against any of its erring members. St. Paul tells his disciple Timothy—"Against a priest receive not an accusation, except under two or three witnesses."† Then the bishops, constituted in the Church under the direction of our Blessed Lord, by the Apostles, had a right, which they did not

\* St. Matt. xviii, 17.

† 1 Tim. v. 22.

receive from any civil ruler, and that was not understood to be under the control of the secular administration, not merely to receive accusations, but to examine into the charge, to receive evidence, and determine upon it: because it is said that unless there be at least two or three witnesses, the bishop must not proceed to adjudicate in the case of a priest. St. Paul himself also not only implies the right to receive an accusation, and to adjudicate upon it, but also asserts a power to punish. He tells the Church at Corinth, and tells them reprovingly, as if they had not up to that time been sensible of the full extent of their power, that they should pass sentence upon a grievous sinner, and the heaviest which the Church is capable of pronouncing, that of excommunication—"Deliver such an one to Satan,"\* that by such means he might be brought to repentance.

Here then, it appears that the Church had within herself a complete right of judicature: tribunals established for judging of ecclesiastical affairs, of proceeding by hearing evidence, of deciding and of pronouncing a spiritual sentence without the slightest necessity of referring, for that purpose, to the civil power.

Again, St. Paul tells Titus—"For this cause I have left you in Crete, that you might set in order the things that are wanting, and that thou mightest ordain priests in every city."† And to his other disciple Timothy he said—"Lay hands suddenly on no man."‡

The Church, then, had all the power that was necessary for providing a succession of pastors, and all that related to this important function (one of the most important) did not belong in any way to the state, but belonged only to the bishop. It was his duty to judge of the qualifications of those who were candidates for the priesthood: it was his place to judge of the necessity of providing pastors, and he is responsible for filling his diocese with parochial clergy, and allotting to each one his peculiar sphere of action and jurisdiction, so as to organize the part of the Church over which he is set.

Again, we have seen that the principle held by Catholics as essential to unity, the principle by which alone unity has (as a fact) ever been preserved in the Church, was that the centre around which all the parts of her system gathered, the foundation on which the whole was based, and towards which all looked,—was the necessity of being united to St. Peter's See, and so united among themselves.

Now it follows that if this be the system (whatever we may think of it in the abstract, for I reason the question upon Catholic grounds, and I assume it to be the system which our Blessed Redeemer established for the preservation of that unity which is of the essence of His Church)—it follows that to break this communication, to prevent it from having its full course, is to defeat as far as possible the ends of our Blessed Lord, and to make void His constitution of the Church. If therefore there is a centre of unity,

\* 1 Cor. v. 5.

† Tit. i, 5.

‡ 1 Tim. v. 19.

and every part of the Church is bound to be in union with it—for the sake of unity—it follows that it is the necessary right of every part of the Church to be in connection with it. And communion cannot take place without the possibility of communication with that appointed authority, that centre of unity.

Here then you have instances of rights belonging to, and of the essence of, the Catholic Church. And such are the exemplifications of the principle I developed in my last lecture.

But that principle goes further than this. I have proved that the system of the Church was established by our Blessed Lord, in total independence of the civil power. I have shown you that from this principle, from the concession of that organization, complete in itself, which took place during the first three hundred years, and had its full development during ages of persecution, it follows, that there are rights secured to the Church which were not given by the state, and were the result of no concessions from the civil power, but arose from the organization given to her by our Lord, and cannot consequently be taken away or trenched upon by any other and subordinate power.

But the argument must be carried further. If there are rights, there must be liberty for the exercise of them. To say to a person you have a right to walk, to eat, and breathe, but I will take care so to tie up your limbs that you shall not be able to walk, I will put your food at such a distance from you that you shall not be able to partake of it, I will enclose you in a dungeon so that a breath of air shall not reach you; would he so talk in the same breath of the existence of rights, and of a power not merely to take them away, but so to cramp and fetter them, as to annihilate them, so that they are of no use. Clearly this would be a mere mockery and delusion. It would not be a *recognition* of the rights. You understand at once that in any state whenever a citizen, or a body corporate, has a right, its existence supposes the power and liberty of using it: and that to deprive the possessor of that liberty is to *unrecognize* it. I say therefore that if organization confers rights, the first article in their specification must be the power or liberty of exercising all acknowledged and legitimate rights. There may be checks; there may be limitations; there may be a certain watchfulness, there may be such combinations, such a concord of rights as may prevent the possibility of any one overstepping the just limits of his liberty; (for everybody is prone to abuse even a lawful liberty) but a destroying those rights by rendering them nugatory, is clearly a violation of them; and if these rights are among those essential for the organization or life of the body, it is equal to extinguishing or destroying it.

These are the principles I must ask you to bear in mind, with regard to what I shall have to say this evening. But before proceeding further, I think it is of the utmost importance to impress this strongly upon you, by evidence derived from our own annals. It is impossible not to observe an important difference in the spirit and

feelings of the whole people of this country, (Catholics alone excepted,) as those feelings are now expressed, and the feelings of our ancestors of old. At present we may say in truth that the rights of every citizen in the state are secured, after many ages of contest; the great rights (as they are considered) not only of the whole nation, but of all the individuals in it, are defined; and we are not much afraid of any power usurping beyond what it is entitled to in the state. These liberties have not been the result among us of any sudden revolution, the overthrow of dynasties, the succession and transfer of different forms of government; but they have been a growth, as gradual, as measured, and as steady and successful as that of a plant, small, but strong, steadily rising from the ground, till it has developed into a splendid tree. Now if at any time you might suppose there could be jealousy of liberty by those who were fighting for it, it would have been at that time when as yet the plant was tender and required great care.

The idea which people now form of the Church in relation to the State is, that the former is almost like a parasite, which, if it grows too near the tree, will suck away from it all its moisture, will deprive it of its nourishment at the root, and closing about it, will, by degrees, press it in a fatal embrace, and having drawn from it all its sap, will leave it dead and withered. The idea is that the Church cannot be too much kept down, repressed, subdued; deprived of its powers; its immunities circumscribed; its action weakened. Certainly that is the tone in which the Church is spoken of at the present day in England, and even by many writers on the Continent.

Now so far was this from being the idea of our ancestors, that at the very time at which they were laying the foundation of that stable constitution, which we point to with such admiration and pride, before foreign nations, so different were the feelings of those who step by step were gaining their municipal rights, and the claims of citizenship, which raised by degrees the burgher to such importance, and made, at length, the very serf or villain on the soil become more powerful than the baron who owned him, so far were these men who, without enjoying the fruits of liberty were planting it for us,—so far were they from any jealousy of the liberty of the Church, that they considered the very first step towards obtaining civil liberty was to grant to the Church the utmost possible extent of that gift; and there is hardly a charter to which we look back with exultation as a noble monument of our ancestors' love of freedom, which does not base the whole of its system of enfranchisement of the thrall and liberty of the subject upon a firm basis of liberty for the Church, and the full exercise of all her rights, untrammelled and unfettered, by the Church of Christ. Let us prove this by a few short quotations.

The very first code of laws which was ever given in this island was formed by King Ina in the year 689. It contained many articles, the effect of which was to regulate the administration of justice, to fix the proper penalties for crime, to put an end to feuds, in other



words, to settle on a firm basis after the agitation of Pagan invasion, and frequent conquest and reconquest, the social and political state of England. This is the preamble of the code.

"I, Ina, by the Grace of God, King of the West Saxons, with the counsel and teaching of Cenred, my father, and Hedde, my bishop, and of all my witan (*i. e.* parliament or council), and a large assembly of God's servants (the clergy), have been considering of the health of our souls and the stability of our realm, so that just laws may be settled and established."

Now after this preamble, what is the first law enacted?

"We command that God's servants (*i. e.* the bishops) hold their lawful rule."

This is a confirmation by the civil power, of all the lawful rights and privileges belonging to the Episcopate of the Church.

Alfred the Great, whose name is dear to every Englishman as one of the most important authors of their liberty, did little more than confirm this code; he recites it, and then declares that, by the counsel of his witan, (including the bishops) the same laws or similar ones were reestablished; for the former laws had been almost abolished, or prevented from being put in execution by the Danish invasion. The third article, in addition to the former ones, secures the right of sanctuary; and others related to various ecclesiastical matters. When, after the Conquest, the people of England wished for good government and good laws, they used to ask for the laws of "Good King Edward," or S. Edward the Confessor, and his laws were ratified by the Conqueror and his successors, in fact they formed the basis of all our noble charters. And this is what we find among them "on the peace, and liberty of Holy Church."

"Beginning therefore, with the holy church, by which the public weal and the kingdom were considered to be kept firm, they all proclaimed its peace and liberty, saying that all the clergy and scholars and all their possessions wherever they may be, shall have the peace of God and holy Church."

And again in the third article it was enacted,

"That it is just that the law of God should everywhere be honored by his servants."

Now we come to the charters after this period. I will only make a short selection. Henry I, in his charter, first confessed that the whole kingdom was oppressed by the exactions of the civil power, and then proceeded to recognise the freedom of the Church. "The whole kingdom is oppressed by unjust exactions," he says.

Now what was the remedy proposed for this grievance?

"In the first place I make the Holy Church of God free, so that I will neither sell nor lease its possessions; nor, upon the death of any bishop, archbishop, or abbot, will I accept of anything from the lord or patron of the Church, until the successor shall have entered. And all bad customs, by which the kingdom of England has been oppressed, I will entirely take away, and put away all that are evil customs."

Now we come to the great charter, Magna Charta, which every Englishman regards as the great foundation of our liberties. How does it commence ?

“ I, John, &c., to the honor of God and the exaltation of His Church, *by the counsel of Stephen*, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Cardinal of the Roman Church, William Bishop of London, &c., &c., and Master Pandulph, the Pope’s Sub-deacon and Familiar, grant and confirm\*—first, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have her whole rights and liberties inviolable, in such a manner that it may appear to men that the freedom of election which was approved as most requisite for the Church, and which was given by charter and confirmed, after the confirmation of the same by our lord the Pope Innocent III,” &c. &c.

And then at the conclusion we read :

“ Wherefore our will and command is, that the Church of England (*Anglicana Ecclesia*) shall be free.”

Henry III, in like manner, assented to this as the first article of his charter.

“ I grant † to God, and by this charter confirm, that the English Church shall be free, and have her whole rights and liberties inviolate.”

What a change has there been in the feeling of this country since that time ! It is clear that the barons who leagued with the bishops to have the rights of the whole nation established by this charter, so far from being jealous of the Church, considered it was a mutual benefit to secure the perfect unanimity and free action of the Church.‡

I need not explain on what grounds it came however to these feelings ; or why the people loved the Church ; how it was the great almoner of the nation, the great hospitaller of the kingdom, how it was the treasurer that administered for the public benefit the possessions with which it was endowed, how it was the best landlord,|| the kindest master ; I put by all these considerations, which it may be said only amounted to feelings of gratitude and affection, not necessarily connected with *principle*.

But the *principle* was this : that those who obtained, sometimes extorted, these charters of liberty, believed, as we do, that the Church is a Divine Body established by our Blessed Lord ; that its rights do not depend upon the civil power, but are the necessary consequences of its organization ; that, therefore, she had rights, and having rights, had a title to liberty ; and therefore they considered that the Church ought to be free in her own sphere, and her own line of action ; as the barons and burghers were to be free in those rights

\* “ *Concessimus et confirmavimus.*” The word “ *dedimus* ” in some copies is spurious, and is omitted in the most authentic. “ *Concessimus* ” is the word of conquest, not implying the *origination*, but the *recognition* of the ancient Saxon constitution.

† *Concessimus, dedimus.*

‡ There was a similar confirmation by Edward I, and so by Edward II.

|| It was a saying in the middle ages, “ It is better to live under the crosier than under the lance.”

and duties which belonged to or devolved upon them in peace and war. The liberty of the Church was then regarded as an integral part of the general liberty of the subject.

Now the contrary feeling, in our own age, arises from another principle. It is not many years since one of our statesmen told the Bishops of the Church now established in this country, that they were mistaken if they imagined that they had any Divine power or jurisdiction: that they were a part of the state: that their institution was merely human; and that they had no claim to any divine or supernatural authority.

This of course leads to the consideration of the Church as an antagonist power, as a rival in the state based upon the same ground: that as a creature of the state it is to be "cabined, cribbed, confined"—fettered in every possible way, and made subservient to the exigencies of the state. Hence it is supposed for example, that now in the nineteenth century the Church is no longer necessary to adjudicate upon doctrine, but that the Queen's courts can decide upon matters ecclesiastical better than the Church can; or again, that it is not necessary for education, for that secular instruction is better than clerical. If people consider these things as the natural result of there being in the Church no Divine mission—who can blame them if the whole tendency of their legislation and of public opinion is to correct what they consider an antiquated system, existing in the state, in order to bring it more into accord with the secular and temporal state of this country.

Now keeping these points and principles in mind, let us proceed to a few historical preliminaries, to guide us in forming a judgment upon a matter of most essential importance.

You will have observed that the documents I have read to you—the extracts from the Saxon Laws and the Norman Charters—were all in reality Concordats. The ecclesiastical and the civil powers met together. There is the Pope's Legate on the one hand, just as there was at Vienna in the present case: in both instances there is the Pope's Legate with the Archbishops and Bishops of the country, who represent the local ecclesiastical powers, and there is the King with his barons, on the other side. It is clear that there were concessions made by the Church, (for it is one part of her liberty to be able to cede some part of the exercise of rights which the state, from its christian character, is called upon to protect,) and then the State, the secular power, confirms to the Church those rights which she had. Thus these articles form *bona fide* Concordats of a very venerable character.

Coming down to times later, and just glancing at the dissensions which took place between the Bishops of France and the Holy See, we see that the certain rights claimed by the latter had been denied by the former—not rights respecting doctrine, but the power of dealing with benefices. At last the differences took a specific form, to which I will call your attention, because it will afford a striking parallel to what has taken place in our own time.

In 1438, Charles VII of France, proclaimed what was called the Pragmatic Sanction, containing thirty-eight articles, and which, without any agreement between him and the Holy See, he promulgated as part of the laws of his kingdom, although they related entirely to spiritual matters. Some of these laws were in themselves not only harmless but good, and such as the Church has often herself sanctioned : but the greater part of them related to questions of canon and ecclesiastical law ; and there was a clear infringement of those rights of the Holy See which had never been disputed. I will not enter into those points now. There had been no previous disputes about them : but now there came a code of laws, the object of which was to tie and fetter the Holy See ; such as that the Pope should be obliged to celebrate a General Council every ten years, and if he did not do it, that the Bishops should do it without him—that the Council of Basle (by whom these articles were dictated, and which had been declared schismatical) should be declared perpetual—and several other points like these, which clearly trenched upon consecrated ground, which the Church had always protected. Here is the first instance of a Sovereign, of his own motion and will, making laws which related to the power of the Supreme Pontiff, and claiming to himself rights which had always been considered as belonging to the Holy See. Of course this was the source of immense confusion, to say the least, in that kingdom. These laws were not recognized by the Holy See, nor any part of the Church, but they were eagerly seized upon by the secular party, and by a portion of the clergy in France. Such was the evil resulting from this state of things, that Louis XI not so much as fifty years after—in 1462—abolished the Pragmatic Sanction altogether. His successor, Charles VIII, revived it ; and then at last came the first great formal Concordat, in which every thing was arranged, and what may be considered as the first outline was traced for all subsequent treaties of the kind. It is known by the name of the French Concordat, or the Concordat of Bologna, for there its articles were stipulated by Leo X and Francis I. The Bull by which it was recognised was published in the Council of Lateran, 1516.

This short Concordat of nineteen articles, arranged everything so satisfactorily between the Pope and the king, that it was accepted as, and continued long to be, the basis of the relations between the two powers, ecclesiastical and civil.

Now keep in mind the facts connected with these points of history, which led to these negotiations. We have a temporal sovereign claiming powers which the Church refused to cede, and considered necessary for liberty of action in the Church. We have another king abrogating that law virtually, and leaving the Church without pact or law upon the subject. We find that in consequence of this state of things, a Concordat became necessary, which made sufficient concessions to satisfy all parties ; and restored that peace which had so long been destroyed between Church and State.

From these preliminaries, I now come down to the middle of the

last century, when a strange spirit came over almost all the nations of Europe. In what I am about to say, I am most anxious to refrain from every thing like blame of individuals, or from throwing the blame of what I consider unjust and irreligious upon any individual. Because we all know, not only from the experience of a country like this, which being constitutional, acknowledges the principle that ministers are responsible for all that is done, but from the practice all over Europe, that after all it is not always the sovereign who must be charged with the evil that is done under his reign. A vigorous and determined man, who secures to himself possession of the helm of the state, has immense power and influence, and often the monarch, though he sees what is right, finds that unless he yields to an influence which has become too strong, he perhaps may bring on what he esteems a greater evil, even the destruction and dissolution of his empire. We are not without instances of that very position at this moment. Now it happened somehow that about the middle of the last century, those seeds which had been scattered all over Europe, first by Jansenism and then by infidelity, began to spring up like tares over the whole field of the Church. One of the great principles of Jansenism was the limitation to the utmost of the Papal power; denying in fact its authority in any way which brought it home to them.

When next Sunday I shall have to speak in detail of the articles of the Austrian Concordat, I will show you more particularly how this action manifested itself, and how it became one of the reasons of the necessity for such a measure. Throughout Europe the appeal to a general council from the condemnation of the Pope; the denial that a Papal Bull, even strictly dogmatical and relating entirely to doctrine, had any validity or force until the State had recognised it; the assertion again and again of a right of local action, independently of the Holy See, which had been so often boasted of by sovereigns and their subjects; the refusal to allow appeals against them being heard in any but national or local tribunals; these principles, urged in a thousand ways, were the means by which the Jansenists sought to defend themselves from censure, and at the same time procure for themselves the protection of the temporal sovereigns as being their best friends in a struggle with the Holy See. There came from this that spirit of infidelity, that mocking of religion, that deriding of its divine origin, that irreverent criticism of the words of its sacred oracles until they were reduced to a mere dead letter, that spirit of lawlessness which began in France, and unfortunately spread through Germany, greatly through the influence of the King of Prussia, and infected and poisoned the literature of all the world. That spirit proceeded upon the maxim so often repeated, but too blasphemous to be here uttered, of crushing and destroying whatever was most holy.\* Now that spirit, while it was for a long time covert and working in secret in every direction, insinuated itself into books which were read in

\* Voltaire's blasphemy, "écrasons l'infamé."

society—into works of a theological character, and was in reality corrupting all true and earnest Catholic ideas on the subject of Church government. Hence there came a system which it is not necessary for me here to describe, under the name of Febronianism, which maintained that the power of the Church was in reality vested in the civil power; that there could not be an empire within an empire, and that as the empire was first and the Church afterwards, that therefore the source of all jurisdiction was in the State, and not in the Church. Such were the principles which spread through all Europe; from Portugal and Spain to Naples, Tuscany, and Germany, but which received their greatest development in the country of which we are speaking.

It was the Emperor Joseph II, who introduced into Austria a totally new system of Church government—for I can call it nothing else—of which he made himself the centre, depriving the Clergy, or the Church and the Holy See, of everything but nominal rights. It would hardly be interesting to you, were I to go through all that was done towards that end under his government; I will not blame him individually, because, no doubt, he was much under the influence of that spirit which had become so general, and which seems, somehow, to have seized, in a peculiar manner, on his government. There was nothing short of a breaking off communion with the Holy See which was not done under his government, towards severing the Church in the Austrian dominions from the rest of the Catholic Church. In the first place, he not only continued that right which had been accorded by the Pope to the Emperor, of nomination to the episcopal sees, but he would not allow the bishops to apply to the Holy See at all: all was to be done through his ambassador. They were not allowed to ask for a single power or faculty, which every bishop in the Church has to obtain from the Holy See, receiving from that delegation a power which the Church considers to be vested in the Sovereign Pontiff, and which no bishop can exercise except by this delegation, and then generally only for a limited period. He would not allow them to apply to the Pope, but insisted that the bishop, as soon as named by him, should exercise every sort of jurisdiction which a bishop can do after delegation from the Holy See. He cut off all possible communication with Rome. The bishop was not allowed to apply to Rome for any grace or favour; for any matrimonial dispensation; for the establishment of any practice of devotion; but he was supposed to be invested, by an imperial ordonnance, with all the faculties necessary for the purpose. All ecclesiastical decrees were swept away; and in a court formed by the law, the bishops were appointed to give dispensations, and they only granted them upon the royal authority, and had to be confirmed by the emperor, and submitted to a council composed of laymen and ecclesiastics. Not only so, but in case, for example, of excommunication, a purely religious act, it was not merely provided that no civil effects should follow, concerning which no complaint would have been made, but that if a bishop

considered that the conduct of one of his clergy deserved this most grievous punishment, there was to be a mixed commission, composed of six laymen and six priests, who were to decide by a majority of votes whether or not the sentence ought to be inflicted. In short, so hard was the state of things, that in 1782, Pope Pius VI took a journey—in those days not a light one—all the way from Rome to Vienna, to entreat the emperor to desist. All however that he obtained was this, that the emperor said, that if there were any bishops of consciences too tender to exercise their episcopal functions without the Pope's approbation, he would allow them to apply for it, but it must be given instantly, without demur, not for any limited number of years, but for their lives. These faculties, moreover, must be submitted to him, and not allowed to have force until they had received his Imperial approbation. Nor was this all, but the only case in which it was permitted to a bishop to have any recourse to Rome, and to have any document returned from it without inspection was what are called rescripts, or indults of the penitentiary. The law of the Church is that when a person has been guilty of a crime which in canon law is not within the power of absolution conferred by ordinary jurisdiction, but is reserved to the Holy See, he must resort to this tribunal of penitentiary. Now this privilege was only allowed in Austria upon the express declaration of the bishop that the case was urgent, that there was no time to have it inspected, and that the examination of it would seriously injure the reputation of an individual or family. Except in that one instance it was not allowed under any circumstances whatever, for any bishop to be in communication with the Holy See, or in intercourse with it.

But then it will be asked, how were these things to be done which till now were reserved to the Holy See? Do you suppose Joseph threw all that power into the hands of his bishops? No; he reserved it all to himself. Every permission to do the smallest thing was to go in lesser instances to the Council of the Province, in higher cases to the Aulic Chamber, and to the Emperor himself. Imagine the position of the bishops, who literally could not move without having to ask permission of their local municipality. Every municipality was composed of burghers, honest men often, no doubt, but not knowing much of theology. And yet he was obliged to submit every word and act to them; to this extent even, that the bishop could not issue his Lenten Pastoral, giving certain dispensations, or enjoining certain devotions, he could not put forth a prayer or proclaim a *Te Deum*, without having his Pastoral submitted first to the burghers, they having to decide whether a bishop was to make it public or not, and having power to correct it as they pleased. Can you imagine any pastor put in a state of more dreadful degradation? Even that, however, is not all; every appointment must be communicated to the Emperor, every canon that was to be made, or every vicar-general named, must be approved of by him. As to the list of students, the Emperor reserved the power of diminishing the number, that is to say, though there might be so

many who had a vocation to the ecclesiastical state, they were not therefore to be allowed to follow it. The Emperor regulated the matter: he regulated that not more than a certain number of priests were required for a diocese, and, therefore, only a certain number should be admitted for Holy Orders. But this was not enough. The principal seminaries were all suppressed; the ecclesiastical colleges were completely swept away from the land. Catholic universities were suppressed. The Emperor established normal schools; every teacher was appointed by him; religious orders were suppressed, and their goods were taken possession of by the state; only a certain number were allowed to remain, but they could not do anything; they could not administer their property; they could not elect their superior; they could not do anything without recourse to the state, without putting everything before the government, and having its approbation. In reading an account of this state of things from the authorized publication, which contains the Canon Law of the Empire, published in 1809, giving an account of Austrian ecclesiastical law, I could not help being amused at the only exception made on this head. After having enumerated in one paragraph all the things that a religious community could not do without the state, it says, there is nothing to prevent the bills presented to them by creditors being paid, even without asking the consent of the government! So that it seems as if these poor religious were to suppose, *a priori*, that even to pay their bills they must have the leave of the government, so completely were they tied and bound up. This system, I need hardly say, soon began to show marks of deterioration; a spirit of rationalism and infidelity soon crept in, where the influence of the Church was thus fettered. I can even remember the disputes going on, on the subject: there were professors who taught more Protestant than Catholic doctrines; there was one of the most eminent professors of Vienna, against whom the Holy See had again and again to protest, whose works were most learned, and in the hands of everyone. I remember reading them myself with the greatest enthusiasm, they were full of wonderful learning, but they led to infidelity; I mean the works of Professor Jahn, the great biblical scholar of Vienna. It was the same in every other department of learning.

I cannot venture now to go so far into this matter. What Joseph or his government did to the Church he did to every thing else in the state. Do not suppose that while thus oppressing the Church they were enlarging the liberties of other bodies. On the contrary, every immunity of the subject, every privilege of classes or persons, even though sanctioned by the most solemn charters, were swept away. Every department underwent the same revolution, the same arbitrary changes; but it was the Church that principally felt his power.

Now you will say that the bishops and clergy, perhaps, may have been displeased, but the people were not so. The letters and remonstrances of the bishops and their people, in every part of his dominions, have been collected and printed in five volumes, and among them is



the letter of one eminent man, the Cardinal Frankenberg, Archbishop of Malines, who suffered severely for his opposition to the law, an opposition which convulsed the whole empire. Austria was in a complete ferment, Hungary was on the point of revolution, and the Netherlands threw off their long attachment and obtained their liberty, merely because the house of Austria was oppressing the Church. There was a popular and general and universal feeling throughout the Austrian states that the government was committing a great oppression. In writing his own epitaph the Emperor Joseph did not hesitate to use these remarkable words:—"Here lies the Emperor Joseph, who was unfortunate in everything he undertook."\*

The laws of the Emperor Joseph were just such as our Henry VIII introduced into this country prior to the Reformation. They only wanted one more step to separate the empire from the Holy See. That step he was prepared to take; indeed, in 1785 he had made up his mind to it. His biographer tell us that he was ready to be totally separated from the communion of Rome. But he was told by the Spanish minister that he had made a great mistake if he thought his empire ready for that, and it was no doubt such representations—that his people were not prepared to become Protestant—which prevented him from taking that course.

The Emperor Joseph died in 1791. He was succeeded by his brother, Leopold II, who only survived him two years, but during that period he continued completely to walk in the footsteps of his predecessor, and even added to the miseries which the Church had to endure.

While his brother had reigned at Vienna Leopold was Grand Duke of Tuscany, and introduced every law of his brother into that country. He had particularly leagued himself with Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, the head of the Jansenists of Italy, who held a sort of synod, condemned by the Holy See in the celebrated bull "*Auctorem Fidei*." It seems worthy of remark that he was one whom, in 1787, Leopold himself obliged to resign his bishopric. He indeed lived to repent of his conduct, but was, during a long time, the greatest torment of the Church in Italy. He, with other clergy, few in number, did his

\* To show the extent of intermeddling with every thing, and the absurd and impious way in which it was pressed upon the people, I will venture, though with pain and difficulty, to print some answers to the popular catechism, published under the auspices of the state at Vienna, in 1785. I could indeed hardly believe it to be genuine if it were not quoted as so by a writer of such high character as Dr. Lingard, who gives it as genuine. But even supposing that it were not so, and were to be taken only as a refined satire, it at least shows the feeling of the people, and what they really thought of these proceedings. These answers, let it be recollected, were to be learned by heart by children, and were couched, as will be seen in the form, at once revolting and burlesque, of the decalogue:—

"Thou shalt not appear at processions with feathers in thy hat.

"Thou shalt forbear all occasions of dispute on matters of faith.

"Thou shalt not hold in thy house any assemblies for purposes of devotion.

"Thou shalt not plant tobacco without the permission of thy lord."

The mixture of arbitrary tyranny and indecent profanity will show how completely every thing sacred was cast at the feet of the state.

part in aid of the grand duke; for in 1787 Leopold held councils of bishops in Tuscany, but out of seventeen only *four* would take part in his so called "reforms." However, the work of Joseph was continued for two years longer, when he was succeeded by his son, the late Emperor Francis. You will see how near we now still are to the time when these things happened; for though it is true that Francis reigned for upwards of forty years, and all of us remember the part which he took in the great alliance of Europe, yet he did not die until so recent a date as 1835. Francis was a pious and virtuous emperor, but he found a system established in his empire; and no sooner had he come to the throne than the great revolution breaking out in France and spreading its fire all over Europe, did not give him much time, perhaps, to exercise the functions of a legislator. Nor, indeed, could any one presume to say what would have been his course, educated, as he had been, with the principles of his father. But certain it is that, although he was himself good and in character most amiable, yet he had what I believe has ever been the characteristic of his family—great firmness of will and great reluctance to part with any portion of his power or prerogative.

Yet during the long course of his forty years' reign it was impossible that the Emperor Francis should have failed to observe the working of these laws. In the first place, he saw that the very party in Europe which had been most active in promoting disregard for the Holy See among Catholic princes turned out to have been, in reality, undermining the royal quite as much as the pontifical authority, and that those who had brought about the decline of Catholic feeling respecting the centre of unity and the necessity of communion with it, were just as anxious to break up monarchy over the whole civilized world, and introduce a wild system of fanatical revolution. The emperor could not but perceive, a few years after this, what had become the state of his own kingdom, and that the same party who had tried to create a revolution in the Church had been as active in bringing about a revolution in the state; while, on the other hand, he could not help seeing that those who were most faithful to the crown, and who rallied round the head of the state in its need, were those bishops and dignitaries who had been so cruelly oppressed under its yoke. He saw and knew that it was the clergy who influenced the people to rally round their emperor, and to allow themselves to be slaughtered in so many sanguinary fields, in defence of their country against foreign invasion. He saw that they who had cultivated the true spirit of Catholicity had also cultivated the true spirit of loyalty and patriotism. He saw that, in reality, his predecessors had been but unconscious instruments in the hands of a party which sought to destroy every sacred and every noble institution in the state as well as in the Church. He could scarcely help observing all this. But even if his own eyes had been closed to it all, he could not have failed to know it from a most significant fact. The national assembly of republican France, wishing to the utmost to humble and depress religion and the Church, adopted, as its own ecclesiastical

law, the code of Joseph! Could his successor, who saw this, fail to see also that these laws were loved and esteemed only by those who hated the Church because they hated and were ready to deny Christianity itself. He could not but fail to feel that it had been a grievous mistake indeed so to alienate the Church from the throne, and so to separate its members from its head.

But that would not be all. He was able also to see what now becomes a most important feature in our reasoning—that these laws had positively failed. There is an Italian proverb to the effect, that he who embraces too much holds nothing. The Emperor had drawn the bow too tightly, and it snapped in his hand. Before his death Joseph had been obliged, in addressing the States of Luxembourg, to revoke all his ecclesiastical decrees since 1781. Leopold himself was obliged to restore to the Belgians the immunities and privileges which had been taken from the bishops. The Prince Archbishop of Vienna, one of those who signed the present Concordat, in a pastoral which was published on the 22nd of last month, admirably sets forth this fact—that the Josephine laws had become a dead letter; they were found impracticable;—to use a common English expression, *they would not work*. It was impossible to think of going on with the Catholic religion at all under these laws: it was impossible that, with any Catholic feelings and principles in the minds of the clergy, they could suppose that it could be right that these bishops should not be at liberty to go to the Holy See when they wanted a grace, a faculty, a dispensation, the use of a devotion, or an indulgence; that they should be cut off from communication with the centre of unity. The consequence was, that the laws were despised and defeated on all sides; and in both Tuscany and Austria they had fallen so completely through that they were no longer observed by any one. The Emperor Francis could not but be aware of this fact; he saw that every day this legislation, though nominally in force, had become contemptible. What was the consequence of this?

But before I state that, let me observe that the Emperor Francis had at his side a faithful minister, one whose name is more than European—one who for so many years at and after the Congress of Vienna is supposed to have guided the whole policy of that empire, in its internal and external relations, and who continued to give it his counsel until the Revolution of 1847, which drove him away, when he came to England, where I had the advantage of speaking to him more than once upon the religious state of that empire. I will mention that though he bears a very different character and may have been thought one of those whose ideas are what is called Erastian, and that he was for giving everything to the Emperor and taking all from the Church, nothing was more contrary to his conduct and disposition; for when there was a debate about modifying the laws upon the subject of matrimony, with a view to render civil marriage valid, as it is in this country and in France unfortunately, his only answer was, “Gentlemen, you may make what laws you like, but the only laws that exist upon matrimony are those of the

Council of Trent; and whatever laws you may make against them must be null and void; therefore it is folly to me thinking of legislating upon the subject, beyond the simple recognition of what the Church has defined." I think I have reason to say from what communication I had with this illustrious statesman long before this Concordat, that he is one who would not be likely to mourn that so admirable a code of law should have been procured. All this, I say, could not but influence the mind of the Emperor Francis, who was so attached to him, and had every reason to thank him for having made his reign so glorious.

I will add another consideration: that when the Emperor Francis went to Rome he visited the Holy Father, observing that he returned the visit which Pius VI had made to his uncle, the Emperor Joseph, by visiting Pius VII. That was just after the Peace; and I remember seeing him, and can well recall that it was edifying to be near him and observe him in the performance of every devout exercise. And it was impossible not to feel that a character so pious, so good, and so religious, thus coming in contact with the venerable, the holy, the saintly Pius VII, and his able, upright, and honest minister, Cardinal Gonsalvi, must form very different impressions from those which had previously prevailed as to the authority of the Holy See, the power which it exercised, and the importance of giving it freedom. Accordingly from that time concessions became frequent, and many laws belonging to the Josephine legislation were abolished.

But when before his death the Emperor Francis summed up the result of his experience and observation of life, when looking back upon his own career, chequered as it had been, and marked with great successes and sad reverses, and grievous sorrows and sufferings to himself, he could but take into full consideration what would establish his kingdom upon the firmest basis and remove the dangers from which he had suffered so severely, and the connection of which, with those exploded principles of Church government, was so clear. He could not wish them to be preserved, to be the bane of those who were to come after him. And I can state, with full knowledge of the fact, that before his death he requested his assembled family as a last favour, leaving this to them as his most sacred bequest—that they would totally abrogate the whole of the Josephine laws.

He died in 1835, and was succeeded by his eldest son, the Emperor Ferdinand I, who, being a truly religious and most exemplary and virtuous man, cared not for the pomps and snares of royalty; but after the Revolution, which for a time destroyed the tranquillity of Austria, he abdicated in favour of his nephew, the present Emperor, then at the age of eighteen. This was in 1848.

Certainly the young Emperor had a heavy charge upon his shoulders in undertaking the administration of that vast empire. As a most religious prince he could not help feeling that there was in reality no ecclesiastical law in the country. Virtually, as I have said, the laws of Joseph had fallen into desuetude and no longer

bound either the Bishops or the State. Still it was his own act; it was the result of his own religious and devout feelings; it was the fruit of his own deep religious convictions which led the Emperor Francis Joseph, without consulting with any one, without taking advice, in April, 1850, when he was only twenty years old, to declare abrogated the whole of the Josephine and Leopoldine ecclesiastical codes. I assert that with the most complete knowledge and certainty; yet it has been represented as if he had been a young, inexperienced monarch, whom the Pope had been alluring or inducing (I know not how) to humble himself at his feet, and had wrung from him this law. I can say it with the utmost confidence that the abrogation of the existing ecclesiastical law was his own act, without communicating with the Pontiff.

After all this you will see what truth there is in the account we have been recently reading as to the manner in which the Austrian Concordat was brought about. How plain are the real facts! You see that new legislation was absolutely necessary. The Concordat is not a thing exacted by the Pope—not extorted in any way, but it was an absolutely necessary, though spontaneous, act of legislation. The empire of Austria was without *any* ecclesiastical law for five years past, the previously existing laws had been formerly abrogated. For more than thirty years they had been virtually in complete abeyance, and had not been carried into execution, and that the Church had returned, with the consent of the State, to a position of freedom, as being necessary or beneficial, to the exercise of her power to the full extent which her Divine mission imposes upon her.

And now let me call your attention to the similarity and concurrence of this Concordat with the first great French Concordat. There the sovereign first usurped ecclesiastical functions and fettered the Church completely; and then, after the pragmatic sanction had been abolished, the Church came in, and an honourable concordat was agreed upon between the two powers of Church and state. This is the history of the Concordat agreed upon by Francis I. So in the present case, after a similar usurpation, Austria was without ecclesiastical laws. A Concordat was positively necessary. To speak of it in any other form was an imposition upon public opinion, for those who put forward such accounts of it too often know perfectly well the untruth of what they have been telling you.

But again, when a person has tried an experiment, and it has totally failed, would you advise him to try it again? If a man has ventured one half of his fortune upon a speculation which has turned out to be ruinous, would you think it honest to tell him to throw the other half of it away after the first? Here is the case of a kingdom that has tried a particular form of legislation, has given it a fair trial for a long course of years, and the empire and its rulers had come to the conclusion that it had proved an utter failure. The Josephine laws had not benefited the Church or the state in any way. And would you advise them, with their eyes opened, again to make that very legislation the law of the empire which had already developed

itself in so disastrous a result? I do not say that it would have been useless (of course it would have been) to ask the Pope to be a party to it, for he was no party to the Josephine legislation. But would you have had that young emperor, after having formally abrogated these obsolete laws, after they had gone utterly out of real existence, try to re-establish them again? Why it would have been folly to have suggested it. He would rather conclude, on the contrary, that the former legislation was to be a beacon and a warning to him not to fall into the same error as his predecessors, the error of depriving the Church of her liberty; that it was a mistake never to be repeated. If so, and if the system had totally failed in practice, then surely the natural course would be to try in another direction, to try a more liberal mode of dealing with the Church and her bishops, to return to the ancient principles which existed long before his time.

It is important to keep all this in mind, for you have an argument of this kind addressed to you:—it is said that, considering the immense hold which the Austrian government had upon the Church, upon the Holy See, upon the bishops, and upon the holders of ecclesiastical property, it was a dastardly thing in the emperor to give it up. Why, in truth, he had it not. It did not exist. It was all gone. It had been swept away. He had to begin again, and he could only begin again by resorting to the acknowledged principles which, as I shall show you, were the only basis of a Concordat.

This is all that remained to show you to-night; that believing in Catholic principles and recognizing the Church as having rights divinely given to it; having already tried Protestant or semi-Protestant legislation, in cramping the exercise of those rights and depriving the Church of the liberty to which she was entitled; and having failed in this and found it fail, and hence having to make a new code of law, the emperor could not make it otherwise than by resorting to the true principles and keeping together the subjects of concordat and legislation. I will show you next Sunday that each article of the Concordat was the wisest that could have been adopted upon Catholic principles. And considering all that we have seen as to the history and laws of the Church, we must, I think, conclude that, instead of being the subject of obloquy and reproach, it merits the highest approbation. Church and state have taken one another by the hand, and have proposed to move together in harmony and peace, mutually promoting each other's interests and the common weal of the empire. All, then, that we can say is, may God bless the union and him who had the noble heartedness, to project and bring it about!

---

FOUR

ADVENT LECTURES,

ON

CONCORDATS,

DELIVERED AT ST. MARY'S, MOORFIELDS.

BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

---

LECTURE IV.

---

LONDON: BURNS, 17, PORTMAN STREET; DOLMAN, 61, NEW  
BOND STREET; RICHARDSON, 147, STRAND; DUBLIN: J.  
DUFFY PRESTON: E. BULLER; BRISTOL: AUSTIN & JAMES;

And by order of all Booksellers.

---

1855.





## FOUR LECTURES, ETC.

---

### LECTURE IV.

---

I COME before you this evening, dearly beloved brethren, to close the series of Lectures, to which you have listened with such kind attention, on the Austrian Concordat. You will probably feel with me the true wisdom of that saying of Holy Writ—"Better is the end of a discourse than the beginning thereof," (Eccles. vii. 9) and not regret that I am now about to dismiss you from the consideration of a subject, which I foretold you on the first evening, would only possess a passing interest, and soon cease to have any hold on the public mind. But even should this be the case, I am confident that you will hear me to the end with the same fairness and kindness with which you have listened to me hitherto; and I will trust that this, my last address to you, will complete the explanations which I ventured to promise. After it I will return to the topic no more; for it certainly is not my intention to notice any replies with which my labours may be honoured.

Allow me, according to my practice hitherto, to retrace my course a few steps, and explain the actual position of our subject. I observed, then, on Sunday last, that in the last half of the past century the Church of Austria had, by a course of purely civil legislation, been completely stripped of her liberty, and fettered in a manner at variance with the rights which on Catholic principles belonged to her. Everything was usurped by the State, that could be conceived necessary for her government; jurisdiction, authority, power of self-education, or of interior regulation, her most spiritual duties, her purely ecclesiastical functions, her office as instructor, her very communication with the centre of unity; all had been mercilessly torn from her. She hung, externally, by a mere thread of stunted concession more than by the strong cords of active communion to the rest of the Church, except that (interior and invisible) there circulated through her veins the warm blood of faith and love, which no earthly power could drain, though it might strive gradually to enfeeble and finally to exhaust.

I showed you how the effort failed thus utterly to rationalise and nationalise the Austrian Church; how these laws were partly repealed, partly paralyzed, and rendered powerless; and how they were at length formally abrogated by the present excellent Emperor on that account.

What was the natural result of such an abrogation? That the Church fell back into her normal state. She resumed all the rights, whether of divine or of ecclesiastical origin, which those laws had suppressed or suspended. The State cut asunder the cords that had bound her and trammelled her; and she was free. She did not, of course, thereby recover property which had been absorbed by the imperial treasury; she did not get back possession of edifices allotted to public purposes, once her colleges or monasteries; she did not obtain external jurisdictions or active powers in mixed causes that had passed to civil tribunals. But all this was as nothing compared with her unshackled state, and with the primeval prerogatives which she had recovered, and with the natural instincts to begin anew, and build herself up afresh, which had been restored to her.

Now it was hardly to be expected that such a condition could suit the Church of 30,000,000 of people under one civil rule. Its contacts with the world and with its rulers were too multifarious to remain undecided and undefined. The days of Constantine were returned. A pious Emperor wished that the Church should be as useful as possible to the people confided to his youthful rule; a grateful Church desired to strengthen his throne, and develop her powers beneath his sceptre. There was a cordial, a high-minded, a religious feeling in his mind, that if the Church had to perform great duties, and diffuse heavenly blessings, she must do it by acting according to the laws of her own divine organization, and the experience of her gradually developed life, and not in obedience to the commands of another, an extraneous, and perchance an antagonistic power.

The very generosity of his act placed the Church on a footing to treat more frankly and more boldly with him. While he had retained every right of his Crown, he had allowed her to hold every right of her Tiara; and both were on fair ground to negotiate. This was noble and worthy of a great mind. All intermediate legislation was effaced from the board, on which the two powers were to make their mutual advances, concessions, and acceptances.

The Concordat between the Holy See and Austria represents most perfectly such an accord as would naturally result from such a state of things between two such Powers. It starts on the basis of a new construction, not of a reparation; of building, not of patching up. Justice has to be done, when injustice has been committed; but it is in the form of a recognition of prior claims, not of a reparation.

To go through it article by article would be long, and probably confusing. For we should be often turning back upon topics already explained, or principles laid down. The Concordat, composed as it

is of thirty-six Articles, is not divided into titles or chapters, each exhausting a particular topic. It will therefore, I think, be more satisfactory, if I group together such articles as are explained by, or referable to, a distinct principle; I mean, of course, a Catholic principle. And further, it may be well to give another preliminary explanation, for the sake of those who are not Catholics.

It is this—The last great settlement of ecclesiastical and disciplinary matters in the Church, took place in the last General Council, that of Trent. This Council was held with the concurrence of all the Catholic sovereigns of Europe, and of bishops from every kingdom. With the exception of some points of discipline (such as one regarding marriage on which option has been left) we consider the decrees of that synod as the basis or rather the code of ecclesiastical law in the Catholic Church. When, therefore, particular local provisions made under Concordats cease to exist, the state of a national Church falls back upon the Tridentine code, and is ruled by it. And the nearer to this the government of a Church is, the closer we consider it to be its normal state.

To come, then, to our subject:—

I. The first Article contains the simple declaration, that the Catholic Church in Austria and all its states shall be maintained complete, with all the rights and prerogatives which it is entitled to enjoy, according to the Divine law, and canonical provisions.

There is no declaration that the Catholic Church is the exclusive religion of the empire, or of the state. The rights of no other body are interfered with. The toleration long since enjoyed in Austria is not interfered with; and therefore no power is here given or asserted incompatible with that toleration.

II. The second Article strikes perhaps most at the root of the previous legislation, and deserves to be quoted at length:—"Since the Roman Pontiff holds by divine right the primacy as well of honour as of jurisdiction, over the universal Church, throughout its whole extent, the mutual communication between bishops, clergy, and people, and the Holy See, on things spiritual, and on ecclesiastical affairs, shall not be subject to the necessity of obtaining any *placetum regium*, but shall be completely free."

You see that the principle laid down as axiomatic and allowed on all hands among Catholics, is, that the Roman Pontiff is the Supreme Head, not only in honour but in jurisdiction, of the whole Church. He has authority and jurisdiction over the whole Church. No one can deny this, in whatever part of the world he may be, for a single instant, and remain a Catholic. The Church, then, is constituted as one body with a single head under Christ. It is absurd in this hypothesis to imagine a living body with the head separated from it, so that no intercourse passes between the body and it.

In explaining the rights which the Church possessed from her very organization, independent of human concession, I took as an

instance and illustration, the right of the body to communicate with its head. Yet this right, here admitted, as based on the very nature of the supremacy, is one of the points by which most displeasure has been caused.

1st. Let me, therefore, first observe, that whatever may be any one's opinion on the right of the temporal sovereign to impart, and use his discretion in allowing the introduction and execution of certain papal documents, the Josephine legislation had carried this provision far beyond what any other European monarch had pretended.

2nd. Further I will remark, that the article in the present Concordat speaks only of spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs, the only ones on which clergy or people can want to correspond with the Holy See.

I know that some will at once exclaim:—"No doubt it is so, but by this permission an excuse is given, and a door open for any correspondence derogatory to the privileges of the Sovereign and the welfare of the State." Of course such an inference may be very natural in those who reason on the supposition that Catholic bishops and priests are of necessity disloyal, and their head in league with them.

But as we happen to know ourselves, and one another to be different, let us be permitted to arrange our affairs on a different basis. As we consider ourselves quite as honest and faithful as others, be not surprised if we legislate *for ourselves*, on that supposition. The Emperor of Austria knows what he is trusting in the Holy See, and whom he is relying upon in the bishops of his own nomination, and therefore may be surely left to his own convictions, probably derived from better information than is likely to reach Protestant adversaries of his legislation.

We believe ourselves, in other words, to be as honest, and as honourable, and as loyal as any other body; and therefore you must not expect that we are to legislate upon the idea that others may have formed of us. The Emperor may be supposed to know on what he depends when he confides in the Holy See, and to whom he trusts when he frankly reposes power in bishops of his own appointment, better than any other who could scarcely have such opportunities of knowing the character of the persons thus confided in. It would be an insult to make such an objection as this. Why are they to be suspected, when they have a power given to them for a particular purpose, of being capable of abusing that power? Why are you to legislate upon the supposition that you are dealing with persons of an unsafe character, at the same time that you make them bishops, and give them a position requiring them to use great spiritual jurisdiction? When you thus confide in them an immense part of ecclesiastical administration, they could, if they were disposed to act faithlessly, do so without the aid of this article,

for they would have much better opportunities of so acting within their own territory if they desired to do any harm to the State, than they could do by any communication with a foreign power.

However, even for this there is a provision, for by the Concordat, an oath of fealty is to be taken by each bishop before his consecration, in which he swears that he will not join in any intrigues or combinations, at home or abroad, for any purpose that could possibly be injurious to the State, but will consider it his duty to do his utmost to protect the State from any disloyal attempts.

Now this prohibition deserves a little fuller explanation. It may be supposed that it has always been exercised by the Crown in every Catholic country. That is not so: for it was never heard of until the mediæval period, when, in consequence of the feudal system, there frequently arose differences between the sovereigns of Europe and the Holy See. As a mere matter of policy, it began to be practised by the kings who happened to be engaged in such contests: that is, they used to seize on any bull or document coming from the See of Rome, for fear it should contain some excommunication,\* interdict or censure, the real weight of which they felt, but which as they thought, they could at least prevent from having any effect, by the suppression of the documents. All these, however, were temporary measures devised for this sole purpose, so that when the contest terminated, there was an end to the prohibition.† You can

\* Thus in this country, Papal Bulls of excommunication were not only recognized but had legal force, and were (when regularly authenticated by the proper officers) pleadable in courts of law. In the "Year Book," 31 of Edward III, fol. 9, Sir T. Seton brought a suit, and the defendant pleaded a bull of the Pope, showing the plaintiff to be excommunicated. And *for that he did not show any brief of excommunication, or any thing sealed by the archbishop, proving it, or other seals which could be authentic*—it was not allowed. Numerous cases could be cited in which bulls duly authenticated were pleaded even by the Crown lawyers. Thus, 46 Edwd. III, 32: The Crown lawyers however, when disputes arose as to presentations claimed by the Crown against the Holy See, advised the Crown to prevent the bulls being brought in, which would necessarily preclude them from being pleaded and proved in courts of law, and so deprive them of their legal force and practical efficacy.

† Thus, as already mentioned, there are instances without number in the "Year Book," of the Crown lawyers pleading and relying upon papal bulls and briefs, which were only disputed when the Crown had a contest with the Holy See as to the temporalities of bishoprics (as in cases mentioned in *Wharton's Anglia Sacra*,) or as to presentations to benefices claimed to be in the patronage of the Crown. When these disputes became serious and constant, a series of statutes were passed ending with the 16th of Richard II, providing that "if any purchase or procure in the Court of Rome any processes or sentence of excommunication, bulls, or other things *which touch the King, against him, his crown or regality, or his realm*, they shall be put out of the King's protection." The chief purpose of these acts was to enforce the "statute of provisors and benefices," (25 Edwd. III.) passed in 1350.. It will be observed that the statute of *præmunire* only regarded bulls against the

easily understand how, when there was no regular communication by post, and when messengers had to come expressly to bring any important document, it was not difficult to intercept them when perhaps there was only one point of communication, by which they were likely to come, as in England, by Dover,\* and in France, when there was only one way of crossing the Alps.

In England, the great disputes with the Holy See were about presentations to benefices, and the claim of the Holy See to appoint priests to vacant benefices by "provision." This was not agreeable to the temporal power, and the consequence was that laws were made against these provisions,† and against documents coming from Rome to enforce them:‡ and to prevent their execution in England, in order to deprive these papal provisions of any force. This was the origin of the statutes "præmunire," and of "provisions of benefices."

It was at a later period, and only with the idea of interfering with documents which came from Rome, and related to the government, that the system was introduced upon the Continent. On the occasion of the celebrated bull "Unigenitus," in which the Jansenists' errors were condemned, the bishops of Brabant pretended that the bull, though relating purely to doctrine, and entirely dogmatical, had no effect among them, because it had not received the royal approbation. Philip IV of Spain, their sovereign, commanded them to accept it, laying down the principle that such bulls did not require any interference on the part of the state, and that the state had no power whatever to interfere with them. In the Josephine legislation in Austria however, every sort of bull, though purely dogmatical, or in which the Pope spoke of doctrine only, was subjected to the state; and the state claimed the power of determining whether it should be published or not allowed to be introduced. All this is now abolished; and certainly one can scarcely see how it would be possible to renew relations with the Holy See by means of a Concordat, without making this most important provision. I need not say that even in those countries in which the system of prohibition still exists, it virtually has become obsolete, and is not enforced. Thus for example, in France, by the organic articles which were added to the Concordat by the first Napoleon, the documents coming from Rome were subjected to an inspection—a *placetum regium*—

regalty or the realm. What these were however, the Crown lawyers, and judges scarcely less severe, had to decide. And under that statute all the clergy in England were indicted in "præmunire," by Henry VIII, and compelled, under peril of forfeiture of all their benefices and *property*, to acknowledge the royal supremacy.

\* Dr. Lingard, in his History of England, gives an instance of Edward II. stopping and searching a papal courier at Dover.

† 25 Edw. III. the Act of "provisors of benefices."

‡ 16 Rich. II. the statute of "præmunire."

but by degrees it has been found perfectly useless to attempt to keep it up, because utterly unprofitable to the state ; since in all the number of years that it has been exercised, the state has never found a single document coming from Rome of which it had any reason to be jealous or suspicious. The consequence is, that, now especially, under the enlightened government of the present emperor of France, there is no sort of limitation to the most free and constant intercourse on ecclesiastical matters between the bishops in that country and the Holy See, and there is no attempt whatever at interference. Surely the example of that empire, in which so much wisdom is shown, in all that is done in Church and State, may go far to show the importance and necessity of introducing a similar system into Austria.

I must now unite, under another head, that which forms the subject of nine different articles, referring more or less to the same subjects. These Articles have for their object the restoring to the Church her free action in purely ecclesiastical matters. Contenting myself simply with reading them, or adding only a passing observation here and there, you will yet see that there is nothing to provoke an outcry in any direction.

The third Article of the Concordat provides for communication between the Bishops and their clergy, and the people. Not only were they, under the Josephine laws, restrained from communicating with the Holy See, but they could not communicate with their flocks, as I mentioned before. That is abolished ; and you ought to understand that such a system is not even allowed in the State Church of England. Did any one ever hear, for instance, of the Bishop of Exeter, or any others, submitting their charges to the revision of the mayors and corporations of their cities before promulgating them to their clergy ? Surely that would seem monstrous ; yet this was the old law in Austria, for which this article is substituted.

The fourth Article provides for the free action of the bishops, and (1.) for their appointing ecclesiastical officers of their own (as vicar's general, etc.), which before they could not do without the approbation of the State. (2.) It relates to ordinations. The bishop is to examine candidates, and promote them. This had belonged, as you saw, to the state. (3.) The article provides for the arrangement of benefices, and the division of parishes, with the advice of the crown, especially for obtaining proper endowments. That is one of the powers inherent in the episcopate everywhere. The bishops, also, have to erect minor benefices ; that is, those which have not cure of souls. They can, therefore, also call on a person to make a proper endowment for such benefices, vesting the nomination to them in the person making the endowment.

As to the division of parishes, that is to be done by the Church, with the concurrence of the crown. We know that altering the limits of parishes may interfere with some local jurisdictions, or local

arrangements, of a civil kind, for such arrangements often coincide with the divisions of parishes, and therefore the civil power is to be consulted; but if the bishop thinks a parish wanting in church accommodation, then he, who can judge best of its spiritual wants, is to apply to the crown; and, if it be necessary to build a new church, or to divide the parish, the concurrence of the crown is required; as it is, indeed, in every case where the Church comes in contact with the civil power, or with secular arrangements. (4.) Then, under this article, freedom is secured in appointing prayers, processions, pilgrimages, functions, funerals, and all that relates to matters of ritual. The bishops are to be free to act without the leave of the magistrate or the civil power in all such matters.

(5.) There is, lastly, under this article a most important provision of freedom to celebrate synods, provincial or diocesan. That is, of course, a purely ecclesiastical matter. The acts of a synod are official and public. The Catholics in England have held, during the last three years, two provincial synods, in which all the bishops assembled, and in which they observed all the rites and forms prescribed by the Church on such important occasions; and certainly, these were to us two of the most important celebrations ever witnessed in this country, including the assemblage of the bishops, with their councillors, from every part of the country;—persons of the highest character, to deliberate on, and enact ecclesiastical laws with the greatest order, decorum, and gravity, and (I will add) with the utmost wisdom and prudence. The acts of the first of these synods have been printed, and have been accepted by the Holy See. The acts of the second are in course of revision at Rome. Any of the faithful, or others, may learn what they are. In the same manner we have held, in several dioceses, diocesan synods with all the observances of the common law. I have held one in this very church, when the faithful were admitted to witness a certain portion of it; and what was done has been printed and made public. It is, then, in these synods that the Church really organizes itself. If there is any spirit prominently running through the acts of all the synods which have been held in France, in England, or Germany, of late, it is self-correction. More than half the acts of these synods have been taken up by correction: I will not say of scandals or abuses (for, thank God, they do not exist among us); but even of the smallest faults that only exist in clerical conduct, as to gravity and decorum, the manner of performing their duties so as to turn every thought to the greatest possible strictness of life—that is what is done in Catholic synods. They do not treat at all upon civil matters, in any way;—the Emperor of Austria knows that well. And so in France: where there had not been synods for hundreds of years—no sooner had the country come under the rule of a sovereign who knew the value of a Free Church, than synods were held everywhere; and most wise and beautiful have the acts of those synods been. This shows that free-



dom to hold them is an important privilege to the Church, and one which will help her much in doing good. Such, then, is the article in this Concordat which makes the bishops free.\*

The fifth Article of the Concordat gives the right of inspection of religious instruction to the Church ; and surely nobody will find fault with this provision, by which the religious instruction of Catholics only is to be under their own clergy.

The sixth Article provides that no person shall teach theology without the Bishop's license and approbation ; and that lecturers are to undergo an examination before a Board appointed by him. In all schools expressly instituted for Catholics, the masters are to be Catholics, and the bishops are to arrange what books are to be used in these schools. This is what is done everywhere : religious instruction in schools is placed under the ministers of the religious bodies to which they belong. All Catholic schools are to be placed under ecclesiastical inspection. The bishop is to examine persons who are candidates for the office of inspector, as to their religious qualifications ; and then, from those who have passed this examination the Emperor selects such as his ministers consider to possess other necessary qualifications. Thus the state comes in to do what pertains to it in superintending the secular portion of the education of the people, in concert with the religious rulers.

Under this Article, the bishop indeed may condemn bad books which are contrary to religion and good morals ; and the government is to prevent the publication of such books. You must, however, observe that there is a great difference on this subject between a country in which there are a number of religions already established, of which each considers itself antagonistic to all the rest, where every man writes and publishes what he pleases, however abusively, and however, to the ears of those whom he addresses, impiously ; there is a great difference between such a country and one in which there is only one religion. Nobody could permit that anything like blasphemy and impiety, or coarse abuse, should be permitted against that religion to be disseminated among those who profess it. This is a principle which every country holds. It may not be *acted* upon fully, but it is *held* even here. It is not so many years ago since there were attempts made to prosecute Catholics for attacking the Church of England : within my own memory Dr. Lingard himself was served with a sum-

\* I may observe, that our synods are not at all parallel to what is called " Convocation " in the establishment, about the authority of which there is so much discussion ; for convocation is a meeting connected with the legislature of the country, and forms part of it. It assembles with Parliament, and more or less, follows its course, being supposed to be the spiritual representative of the country, as the other portions of Parliament are of the laity. This our synods have nothing to do with. They have no connection abroad, more than here, with the state ; and do not pretend to touch, or concern themselves with the functions which belong to the legislature.

mons, procured by Dr. Kippis, of Cambridge, citing him to appear before the ecclesiastical tribunals for abusing the Protestant religion. That of course would be impossible now, but it shews the readiness to make use of old laws to coerce religious opponents. I will take the question, however, on higher grounds. In this country, the only religion which is recognized as protected by the State—or rather, the only way in which, in a country where controversy is such a *necessity*, as it must be here, religion could be considered as protected by the state—is under the general name of Christianity. Men are not allowed to impugn “Christianity;” and blasphemy against “Christianity” could still be punished. We can all remember prosecutions for blasphemy, and some very remarkable ones. Indeed, we have had a case before the public within the last few days illustrating the subject—the case of “Bible Burning,” as it is called. What was the law laid down in that case? That if a person burnt a Bible, even although he might think it a corrupt version, and full of errors—nay, even dangerous to men’s souls—yet if he burnt it with a view to insult or outrage it, then he would be liable to punishment (probably imprisonment with hard labour), for a misdemeanour. Upon what ground was that put? Not that it was a Protestant Bible, as identified with the Protestant religion; for it was said, that if Protestants burnt a Catholic Bible with the same *animus*, the offence would be the same, because it was said that this would be an offence against “our common Christianity;” so that Christianity seems to be thus constituted a kind of *genus*, which is protected while the various *species* are let loose against each other. But in a country in which Christianity is identified with only one form of religion, it follows, that whatever you say in defence of Christianity, is in defence of that only form in which it is known. To the mind of an Italian, a Spaniard, or a Tyrolese Catholic, you cannot make it understood that you might attack and vilify Catholic doctrine, and yet be supposed to respect “Christianity.” In this country, a man might write against the Holy Trinity, and might say the most awful things upon the subject (in fact, you see such blasphemies in printed periodicals week after week); or again, the divinity of our blessed Lord may be scoffed at; yet it would be hardly sufficient to constitute, in the opinion of this country, an attack upon “Christianity.” So long as the parties uttering such impieties profess to derive them from the Bible, and declare that the doctrines they impugn are not to be found there, and are “inventions of men,” they have the “right of private judgment” as well as those who profess to find them in the Bible. But speak to a Catholic against the adorable Trinity, or against the divinity of our blessed Lord, and tell him that you are not infringing Christianity, but only Catholicity; that you are a Unitarian or a Socinian, or less (if possible), but that you are nevertheless a “Christian;” he will not be able to understand you. Look at the sect now spreading so immensely—and in America almost promising to become a separate state—a sect in which Poly-

gamy is publicly taught and practised as it is in this country, and in this metropolis, where there have been sermons delivered and published in which the bond of matrimony is proclaimed to be a totally human invention, and every man is allowed to give full scope to his passions! That is not taken up by the state: it is not considered to be against "Christianity." It is considered as only against the views of different religions: it is itself a religion, or a "religious sect." But go abroad, and tell people that in preaching the dissolution of the connubial tie, a person is not speaking against Christian morals, but only against Catholic morals, and they could not be made to understand the distinction; therefore, when there is a decree that the Catholic religion shall be protected from all blasphemy and insult, and all injurious books; when every book against public morality, or against the Catholic religion, may be prohibited by the bishops, they will pronounce upon the doctrine of the book, and then the state will prevent it from being circulated (and as it must do so here, if contrary to public morals), that proceeds only on the same principle as the law here, preventing anything insulting to what is considered the symbol, not of the Church establishment, or of Protestantism in general, but of Christianity—meaning the Bible. In Catholic countries there is an identity between Catholicity and Christianity which cannot be destroyed.

The next Articles relate to juridical jurisdiction in matters purely ecclesiastical—those on which the bishops have power to adjudge. Two of these articles relate to the faith, the sacraments, and other such matters; ecclesiastical functions, the Liturgy, etc. It is clear that the state can have nothing to do with these. Next, they regard all cases of religious offences in the clergy connected with such ecclesiastical matters. When (for instance) one of the clergy commits an offence which affects purely ecclesiastical or religious subjects, such cases the bishop can judge, and even punish. Even under the Josephine laws, there was a power of punishing by moderate confinement, or fasting. Suppose the priest would not conform to the rules of the diocese in matters relating to ecclesiastical discipline; or suppose he was guilty of gross impropriety, such as great neglect, or giving great scandal in the administration of a sacrament,—this would not come under the civil tribunals: in such cases, the bishop has the power of inflicting such a punishment as the canon law would warrant, which is a limited period of confinement, not in a prison, but in a college, or religious house; and perhaps, if the priest has a benefice, or possesses property, a pecuniary penalty might be imposed. The canon law permits this, and so I presume it is intended by this provision.

There are other similar cases in which the bishop has a purely ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In former times, every bishop had his regular tribunal, his officers, and assessors to summon and judge offenders in cases which came under his cognizance; but all cases in-

volving civil consequences which used to go to the ecclesiastical tribunals, now go to the civil tribunals. Matters connected with wills and marriages, and many classes of offences, such as blasphemy, public scandal, swearing, incontinence, slander, brawling or disturbance in a church,—these belonged to the ecclesiastical courts, but are not now restored to their jurisdiction.\* It is clear by these limitations that no cause whatever regarding laymen can come under an ecclesiastical tribunal; so that the laity are not brought under ecclesiastical law any more than they were before. There is not one case of purely civil jurisdiction directly given to the bishops. They have only power in clerical cases of judging in matters relating to the sacraments, and to faith, and in punishing the clergy who are guilty of ecclesiastical offences. The *civil* causes, even of the clergy, as in disputes about wills or inheritances, or any secular matters, go, not to the ecclesiastical, but to the civil tribunals; so also all *criminal* cases of the clergy, as if a priest commits any offence (for instance, strikes any one), go to the civil tribunal, although they used to go to the ecclesiastical courts. The clergy have acquired no exemption. The only new thing is, that when a criminal action against a priest is brought before a civil tribunal, there is to be notice of it sent to the bishop, that he may put himself in communication with the priest; and in order, likewise, that if the case have in it any ecclesiastical culpability, he may be able to look into it. And further, it is provided, that if the case is one involving more than a certain amount of punishment—a fine, say of 500 florins—the tribunal is obliged, not only to make it known to the bishop, but to communicate to him all the facts of the case, which it is to do in lesser cases also if he requires it. This provision is made, first, that the bishop, the natural defender of the priest, may see that he has fair play; and next, that he may see whether the priest is worthy of any further trust; for if guilty of a serious offence against the law, the bishop could no longer trust or employ him in his sacred office.

Such, then, are the cases where jurisdiction belongs, in whole or in part, to the bishops: all others go before the civil tribunals. In these, a recommendation is made that a priest accused of any crime should be treated with due regard to his clerical character. In the Catholic Church, holy orders is a sacrament which imprints a *character*, and this should be respected on many grounds, especially from a fear of scandal. It happened a short time ago, that a priest was seized in the streets of this metropolis upon some accusation which turned out to be a mistake, and was given in charge to a policeman. In vain he protested that he was a priest, and proffered his card and references to prove that he was so. He was publicly dragged along the streets

\* All of these matters at canon law were of ecclesiastical cognizance in this country, and most of them are so at this moment. In cases of slander, the concurrent jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts was only abolished last year.

to a police station; his pockets were rifled; he was locked up in prison; he was prevented for some time from communicating with his friends; and then, when he was brought before the magistrate, and the charge appeared to be utterly groundless, he was told, forsooth, that he might bring an action against his accuser; but as he happened to be a person of no property, he was recommended not to pursue that course; and he was refused all reparation on the part of the government. Now surely it is not an improper recommendation to make, that a person in holy orders should not be taken up by the police and put into prison without some regard to his sacred character; and it would be easy to ascertain if he possessed it, and to pay respect to it if he did. In this very instance, the priest could have been put into some conveyance to take him to the police station. He asked it, and it was refused. Surely no one would find fault with an enactment even that the clerical character should be respected (especially before any guilt is established), and even when it is necessary to proceed against a priest, and to inflict imprisonment, that he should not be confined with common felons: that is certainly not unreasonable.

I have thus stated what will, in virtue of this Concordat, pertain to the clerical and the lay tribunals respectively. I should only add, that in mixed causes concerning presentation to endowed benefices, the lay presentation is of civil, and the clerical of ecclesiastical judicature.

Next comes the question of the appointments to bishoprics. The Emperor of Austria has always had the nomination to all the bishoprics in his dominions. In the kingdom of Hungary, indeed, he has particular rights and privileges. There the Emperor holds an almost ecclesiastical position and character: upon that ground he had rights which were specially conceded. He has always appointed to the bishoprics; but under the late Josephine legislation, it was claimed as a right, independent of any concession, and bishops were forbidden to apply to the Holy See for faculties and powers. There is no innovation, then, in this provision. The Emperor has still the nomination to all the Sees, just as he had before, with this difference only: that the Emperor himself wisely agrees, before naming any one, to submit the nomination to the consideration of the bishops of the province. Here in England we know how the bishops of the establishment are named at the presentation, and by the advice of the First Lord of the Treasury, or Prime Minister, who, if he happens to be a Low Churchman, chooses a Low Churchman; if a High Churchman, he elects a High Churchman; and hence the diversities of opinion among the clergy are carried up to the bench. Would it not seem better, if any one's advice is to be followed in presenting bishops to the church, that the crown should take the advice of the bishops, in whom it has already shown confidence, as to the qualifications of the person proposed, and not take him because he was head master of a grammar school, or has been useful in elections, or has edited a Greek play, or has been tutor of an illustrious family? Every one knows that these

are some of the means by which the ascent has been made easy from the curate's desk to the episcopal bench; but would it not be better that men in the same position should have the opportunity of speaking as to the qualification of one who is to be their colleague? Is it not a rule of the English law that no one is to be consulted for the sake of his *opinion*, but one who is *expert* in his own profession or craft. One would suppose certainly that the best advisers of the Crown in the nomination of bishops, would be the bishops. In other countries, when the sovereign is to select a bishop, he consults those worthy of his confidence;—who among the clergy of his dominions are most fit? and then names a bishop according to this judgment, for he knows very well that bishoprics are too important to be given by favour or connection. The Emperor, then, retains the nomination of every bishop in Austria; the Pope has not claimed one to himself.

Then as to the chapters; according to the canon law, the Pope names the first dignity, the dean, unless some one else has a local right to name him, and then the bishop names the second; but the other canons and prebendaries not in private right, are to be named, according to canon law, by the bishop or Emperor. And where they are to have for their maintenance a certain fund, called the Fund of Religion, the Pope concedes to the Emperor the pre-nomination.

But observe next how priests are to be appointed to benefices with cure of souls, and say if the provision is not a wise one. They are not to be appointed by favour, but by what is called *concursum*, as is done in Rome; that is, when a benefice is vacant, notice is to be given that there will be an examination, and any priest can present himself for examination; the bishop, who holds the examination, names the three "most worthy," from whom the Emperor selects one. Can there be any plan better conceived for securing a good parochial clergy? Suppose all the parishes of England were thus opened up to fair examination before a board, and the rectors or vicars chosen out of those who passed that examination the best, would not that give great satisfaction? Wealth or birth would then lose its influence; favour or family arrangements would not govern the bestowal of benefices, but opportunity would be afforded to quiet learning, and obscure piety, and unknown genius, to come forward and obtain their proper position in the Established Church.

The Pope has the power of erecting new sees, and altering the limits of those which exist, with the concurrence of the State. Every measure of this kind is to be arranged with the government.

The next head of the Concordat relates to the religious orders. They are restored to their former position. The Emperor Joseph took away from the regulars the power of corresponding with their superiors general, and he appointed new superiors in his own dominions, whom they were legally bound to obey. This is now abolished; and the regulars are put in the same state as in every other country. In France, Italy, Spain, England—everywhere they

have the right of communicating with their own superiors.\* The only restriction is this, that any bishop wishing to introduce religious of any other order that does not already exist in his diocese, must communicate with the government on the subject, and come to an understanding with the government. You see that government has its full share of controul in this matter also.

The seminaries are to be under the bishop in all things.† As I stated before, the Emperor Joseph entirely abolished these seminaries, and substituted a sort of secular *gymnasium*, where there was a mixed education, by professors appointed under the State, without any kind of ecclesiastical supervision. This was the cause of a great rising in Belgium upon the occasion of one of these gymnasiums being opened by the Emperor Joseph at Malines. The people rose and shut it up, and drove the professors out : when he opened it a second time they shut it up again, and drove his professors out again. The third time, however, the people were not satisfied with that, but they burnt it to the ground. So strong was the feelings of the people in favour of ecclesiastical seminaries brought up under the care of the bishops, and not under the eye of the State! Who, indeed, can doubt that the education of persons for the priesthood should be under the priesthood? What would you say if the government were to issue an order that Woolwich arsenal should be placed entirely under the direction of physicians? or that our great medical schools should be under the care of the clergy? You would surely say that the persons entrusted with our administration must have gone out of their minds! So of a system under which clergymen should be educated by laymen, who have no peculiar or proper education or qualification for the purpose, and want the traditions of religious and clerical education requisite for the work. This article, in short, only secures to the bishops what they have enjoyed in France and Belgium, and in every other country, but Austria, for centuries.

Next as to ecclesiastical property: (1.) The Church has asserted for her the right to acquire and to hold property just like every other corporate body. There are to be none of the trammels which here are imposed upon the Catholic Church in that respect,‡ but

\* This was secured to (or rather recognized in) the religious orders in England expressly by the statute Edward I. *de asportatis religiosorum*.

† Seminary in Catholic phraseology, does not mean simply a "School," but a college or school in which students are to be trained for the ecclesiastical state, and their studies are to be directed so as to form them into good priests.

‡ By the mortmain laws of the middle ages, religious houses, for feudal reasons, were prohibited from taking land without licence from the Crown (which was always granted when on requisition it was found that no feudal wrong would be done to the lord of the soil, or to the realm), but there was no restriction on gifts for religious purposes to private persons in trust, which

people are to be free to communicate for the wants of the Church, and the title of the Church, also, as free to invest and manage her property, is put upon the most satisfactory legal footing. (2.) All property of a religious character is to be restored, and a new form of administration to be arranged. These funds are to be applied to the seminaries; to church building; to the expences of public religious worship, &c. I must here observe, that the Emperor Joseph was at least honest in what he did financially. The property which he took from the Church was not, and has never been, united to the property of the State; it was not confiscated, but it was put on one side; and, notwithstanding the vicissitudes, the wars, the revolutions, and the oppressions to which the Austrian empire has been reduced, this property has never been incorporated with the public treasure, but it has been administered strictly by a body of commissioners for purely ecclesiastical purposes. And, although I cannot positively assert it of my own knowledge, I believe that the twofold division of the Fund of Religion still existing signifies the distinction between those portions of it which arose from the seizure of religious houses, and those which came from the spoliation of the colleges and universities. The article under consideration stipulates that the property still existing *en masse* in the hands of the government, and originally taken by spoliation from the Church, shall be *bona fide* given back to her again, but to be administered upon a plan not yet determined; and which the government and the Holy See reserve for future arrangements. Possibly there may be a mixed administration. But it is to be understood that to this general fund is to be added the profits of vacant benefices, which ought to go either to the Crown or to the Pope. The Emperor has had the generosity, however, to relinquish the possession of the revenues of benefices in custody of the Crown while vacant. He gives them up, and desires that they may go towards the fund for the increase of education and religion, and no property belonging to the Church can be alienated without the consent of the Holy See and the Crown. There is, moreover, a promise upon the part of the Crown to supply sufficient means for benefices that are not sufficiently endowed. This is designated by the word *Kongrua*, which has been translated as if it meant the making of a sufficient dotation out of the funds of the Crown. But the Crown only promises to guarantee it by the public faith, or by giving a sum secured by way of dotation on the lands belonging to the State. In fine, where tithes prevailed or have not been commuted, they are to continue to exist still, and are not interfered with; and where they did exist before, and have been usurped, and have got into private hands, the Crown offers to make it good without disturbing the present possessors. I have already mentioned on

is restricted by the Act of 9th George II., the *modern* mortmain law, as it is inaccurately called, though it has nothing to do with mortmain, an expression applying merely to land held by *corporations*.



a former occasion, that the Emperor had provided that property taken from the Church is to be restored, equivalently, but that the holders should not be molested, and that it should be made good from the Crown.

There remain only one or two points, which indeed I have already partly anticipated, on which I had to say a few words. One relates to the prevention of public insults upon religion or its ministers: the other regards what is called the immunity of churches, or the right of sanctuary.\* This provision has been much blamed. It is simply a restoration to the Church of a privilege which it had from the beginning—at least from the time the Empire became Christian under Constantine. The heathen themselves had given it to their own temples, and in the old Mosaical Law it was made by God the privilege not only of the temple but of certain cities set apart as cities of refuge; the difference being, that if a person got there he could not be arrested or molested at all. In the Catholic Church, however, it is not so. In this country, at present, we know that if a person accused of a crime fled into a Church, and attached himself even to the horns of the altar (if there were one), he would be dragged thence without its being considered that there had been any outrage or offence offered to God in such an act. That is not so in the Catholic Church, which does not permit persons to be taken by violence out of a Church, without the consent of the Clergy. I remember an occurrence at Rome, which very well illustrates the rationale of the doctrine of sanctuary. A person who had committed a crime, rushed into a Church for refuge, and went up to the altar; but the *gendarmes* followed him and seized him. There was an encounter and blood was shed. It was one of the largest and most frequented churches in Rome; but according to the provisions of the canon law, it was shut up, and had to be re-blessed, because it had thus been desecrated. The present Concordat provides with wisdom for such cases. If a person takes refuge in a Church, he may be watched and prevented from escaping, while permission is obtained from the ecclesiastical authorities; and on shewing that the man is guilty of something, he is taken, with due precautions, at a time when the doors are shut, and there is no congregation present. Here it is enjoined, in this article, that this immunity of Churches shall be respected, so far as the public safety permits of it.

\* As to which, see the laws of King Alfred, and of Edward the Confessor, cited in Lecture III. *Ancient Laws of England*, v. i. And for an instance of the recognition of the right, temp. Henry VII, the Year-book, Term. Pasch. i, Hen. VII. 15, cited by Dr. Lingard in his *Hist. Eng.* v. iv. p. 134, *in notis*. The doctrine of sanctuary died out after the Reformation (though it is treated of by Lord Coke), but vestiges of it remained even until modern times, as in the instance of White Friars, rendered so celebrated by the romances of Scott and of Macaulay.

After having thus gone through all the articles, with the exception of two, which would possess no public interest whatever, and having shown its complete adaptation to the case required; that is the construction of a church-system as conformable as possible to the best organization required by the Catholic Church in our times, I will proceed to ask what can have been the motive for all the exaggerated feeling which this measure has aroused? Is it that its exciters are really so solicitous for the salvation, and the spiritual welfare of the subjects of Austria, that they fear these may be imperilled by over subjection to the Sovereign Pontiff's religious influence? Or, while a few years ago, the same persons were so indignant at a rumour that our government had inspected the correspondence of refugees suspected of therein carrying on treasonable intercourse with foreign conspirators, for the overthrow of the very throne in question, and considered it a violation of the rights of man, are they really afraid that the free correspondence of Austrian bishops with the Pope would be dangerous to its welfare or safety, and therefore are indignant that the Crown of that empire should have given up the right of opening all letters between them; or do they believe that correspondence with the head of their church should be put by Catholics on a lower scale of respect and privileged security, than that between avowed plotters against the peace of realms? Or finally do they pretend to some vested and violated interest in the appointments to deaneries, professorships, or parishes, or have they share in some missionary schemes for the proselytising of Austria, and the education of its people on a non-catholic principle?

Certainly none of these reasons exist for making the Austrian Concordat an English national question, and investing it with the factitious importance of a European interest. We shall not go much astray, if we explain this commotion on another ground. For some years the idea with which our public has been entertained is this: that the Catholic faith, as an active principle, has been gradually dying out on the Continent of Europe; that the power of the Holy See has become decrepit, its influence has declined to almost non-entity; that the ancient vigour of the Church is effete, and incapable of further exertion, or even self-preservation. Such assertions are rung out in peals during one month of the year, and from the cathedral of unorganic protestantism in this metropolis;\* they are periodically repeated by the informers of the public mind; they form the Pœans of religious commemorations, and the burthen of festive exultations.

When consequently there comes forth suddenly a new and unexpected demonstration of the power and vigour of this religion, and of Him who rules its destinies; when both are found to be still respected by great empires, and the principles of the one, and the rights of the

other are seen to be recognized, revered, and highly prized by Powers strong enough to weigh heavily in the scales of European influence, a strong "religious" indignation is excited, that what has been declared impotent should presume to be powerful, what has been proclaimed extinct should have the hardihood to exhibit itself actually full of life. Then the key is changed ; and the dangerous energy of the Papal power, and the facility with which it yet subjugates kingdoms, become the topics of rampant eloquence.

Which ought you to believe of these two conflicting alternatives ? Simply neither. The Catholic Church is as weak and as strong as ever. She is as weak as ever in overcoming the malice, the cunning, the violence of men. She is still circumvented by promises which she deems earnest, by declarations which she considers sincere, by conduct which she believes to be at most equivocal. She is oppressed, as ever, by the arbitrary enactments of states : she is robbed by their spoliation, exhausted by their worrying vexations. Her bishops are still banished, and her priests imprisoned ; her religious driven from their homes. These marks of a weakness inherent in a body that is not of this world, and claims not legions of angels for her defence, are eagerly seized on, as proofs of declining vitality. Tacitus might have drawn the same inference, when writing of the days of Nero, or Pliny of those of Trajan.

But the Church is as strong as ever in the spiritual life of faith : she is as young, as brimful of vigour as at any other period. Nay in unity she was perhaps never before so strong : in absence of dissonant schools, or varying systems, never so harmonious. One hears no more in her words that express nationality in religion—scarcely in liturgy or in rites. Hence the tendencies of most countries is to drop peculiarities of local ecclesiastical legislation, and return to similarity even of forms, though there has been no diversity of faith. And here lies Rome's strength.

The sun's greatest power lies not so much in his warming or lighting his system, great as it is. This is a limited attribute. We can measure how much and oppressively stronger it is in Mercury or Venus ; how deficiently and tryingly weaker in Jupiter or Saturn. But his attractive force is unenfeebled by distance. When we see him curbing in the chariot of the first with its prancing satellites, and coercing the other into his huge orbit, however encumbered by his colossal zone, we recognize his high prerogative as the centre of attraction, the regulator of movement, and the very lord and king under God, of the system which he so beneficially controls as well as cheers.

And this is the greatest prerogative of the Holy See, by a dispensation no less real and no less divine. Its genial beams may not possibly reach more distant regions. The Chinese or African catholic may not receive so much of that civilizing influence which it has diffused over the universe, be it learning, arts, devotions,

or spiritual life, as they who bask more immediately beneath its light. But as obedient to its laws, true to its faith, attached to its communion, as guided and regulated in the sphere of ecclesiastical action, there is no distinction between the nearest and the remotest. The American republican is as fully Catholic and Roman as the Tuscan peasant. And to this holy influence the Austrian Empire is as subject as the smallest power, which acknowledges the spiritual dominion of Rome fully and sincerely; and its Ruler, not merely now, but in every age, has considered it an honor to be styled by the Pontiff who addressed him as his well-beloved son.

It is no new power then which has been here put forth; but only one inherent in the Holy See, and never weakened. It has brought forward no new pretensions, no upstart rights. It has acted with that openness and definiteness which have always marked her dealings with the powers of this earth. All honour to him, who has known so well to preserve the dignity of his sublime position, and vindicate all its just rights.

And honour no less to him, who glories in the title not less noble than that of Emperor, the title of Apostolic King, before whom the cross is borne as only before archbishops, and who enjoys power almost legatine in parts of his dominion: and who has not forgotten to honour religion and that Church which has ever honoured him and his. He has known how to act in a noble and generous spirit towards her; how to efface for ever the wrongs of generations, and dry up the tears of nearly a century without grudge, and yet without loss of a single prerogative of his crown. For all this, God will no doubt reward him in his own family, and in his vast dominions. Through him may many nations yet enjoy peace and plenty, till his Imperial brightens into a celestial diadem.

And to you, my brethren, be a similar blessing, though not springing from the same high source. Bright be your crown too, beyond what earth can light up with gold and jewels, for your earnest faith, your enduring firmness, your patient charity, and your staunch fidelity to the religion of your fathers, in communion with the rock of Peter. May he who has made you partakers of its strength, make you also sharers in its glory.

THE END.







